Vol. LXIX, No. 1 July, 1923

The Ecclesiastical Review

A Monthly Publication for the Clergy Cum Approbatione Superiorum

BX
801
.E17
v.69

CONTENTS

ST. THOMAS AQUINAS—SIXTH CENTENARY 1
The Right Rev. JOHN T. McNICHOLAS, O.P., Bishop of Duluth, Minnesota.
ST. THOMAS THE THINKER 10
The Rev. FRANCIS P. SIEGFRIED, Overbrook, Pennsylvania.
CLASSROOM DISEASE AND THE SCHOLASTIC PRESCRIPTION. 21
The Rev. J. EDWARD COFFEY, S.J., Woodstock, Maryland.
ST. THOMAS, POET-LAUREATE OF THE EUCHARIST 40
The Right Rev. Monsignor H. T. HENRY, Litt D., Catholic University, Washington, D. C.
"SACRIFICE" ACCORDING TO THE ANGELIC DOCTOR 47
The Rev. JOSEPH BRODIE BROSNAN, M. A., Rochdale, England
ECONOMICS OF AQUINAS 64
The Rev. EDWARD F. MURPHY, S.S.J., Ph.D., Baltimore, Maryland.
ST. THOMAS THE PREACHER 70
The Very Rev. HUGH POPE, O.P., S.T.M., D.S.S., Rugby, England.
MARYKNOLL MISSION LETTERS. XLII: A Catholic University for South China.. 78
The Rev. J. E. WALSH, A.F.M., Wuchow, China.
BREAKING THE EUCHARISTIC FAST 86
ANOTHER VIEW OF THE MIXED MARRIAGE QUESTION 87
The Rev. M. V. KELLY, C.S.B., Toronto, Ontario, Canada.
ORTHODOX TEACHING ON THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS 89
The Right Rev. ALEXANDER MacDONALD, Bishop of Victoria, B. C., Canada.
MISSIONARY AND PAROCHIAL SHEPHERDING 90
PRIESTLY MINISTRY AT THE DEATHBED 91
RECENT THEOLOGY 94
The Rev. FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R., Rome, Italy.

CONTENTS CONTINUED INSIDE

AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW
1305 Arch Street THE DOLPHIN PRESS Philadelphia, Pa.

Copyright, 1923: American Ecclesiastical Review—The Dolphin Press

Subscription Price: United States and Canada, $4.00
London, England: R. & T. Washbourne, 4 Paternoster Row Melbourne, Australia: W. P. Linehan, 309 Little Collins St.
Entered, 5 June, 1889, as Second Class Matter, Post Office at Philadelphia, Pa., under Act of 3 March, 1879

BROTHERHOOD CORPORATION

E. R. EMERSON and L. L. FARRELL, Sole Owners

(Succeeding the Brotherhood Wine Co., Established 1839)

Producers of the Finest Sacramental Wines in America

New York Office, 71 Barclay St.,
Vineyards, Washingtonville, N. Y., and California

Loyola (Moderately Sweet)
Loyola (Moderately Sweet, Res. Vint.)
Loyola (Dry)
Loyola (Dry, Reserve Vintage)
Veravena (Imported from Spain)
Liguorian Riesling
St. Benedict (Sweet)
Cardinal Red (Dry, Claret Type)

Kindly ask for Price List

Revenue tax will be added and kegs at cost

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM PRELATES AND PRIESTS ON REQUEST

We extend a cordial invitation to the Rev. Clergy to visit our vineyards and cellars

Altar Wines sold direct to the Reverend Clergy only

Important—See full-page advertisement inside

JUNE 13, 1922.

The Archbishop of San Francisco takes great pleasure in certifying that the wine made by the Jesuit fathers, at Los Gatos, California, satisfies all the requirements of the Church when there is question either of the purity of the wine, or the canonical conditions of its use.

LOS GATOS, CAL., JANUARY 15th, 1923.

Rev. Dear Sir :

The Altar Wines at Los Gatos are made and cared for by our own Brothers; men who have consecrated their lives to God in religion.

His Grace, the Archbishop and the Rt. Rev. Bishops have the fullest confidence that such men, above all others, can be trusted to supply the Altar with not only pure vinum-de-vite, but also made with religious zeal in the observance of all the canons of the Church.

Respectfully yours,
SACRED HEART NOVITIATE, THOS. R. MARTIN, S.J., Rector.

"NOVITIATE" "MALVOISIE" "L'ADMIRABLE" "VILLA JOSEPH"

Sole Eastern Agents

Barnston Tea Co., Limited

6 Barclay Street **New York**

PURE ALTAR WINES

BEAULIEU VINEYARD

Made from grapes produced in Beaulieu Vineyard and St. Joseph's Agricultural Institute, at Rutherford, Napa County, California. These wines are made under the supervision of Rev. D. O. Crowley, appointed for that purpose by His Grace, Archbishop E. J. Hanna of San Francisco, as attested to by his unqualified endorsement.

Our Pure Rubrical Altar Wines are also recommended by a large number of Archbishops, Bishops, Monsignors and Priests throughout the United States. For the convenience of the Reverend Clergy and Religious in the East we maintain a distributing station at No. 47-49 Barclay Street, New York City, N. Y., where at all times a large stock of all grades of our Pure Altar Wines are carried on hand.

The vineyards from which our wines are made are situated in the best wine belt of California, which is celebrated for the finest Altar Wines produced in that State.

Price Lists, Government Application Blanks, and Samples of all grades of our Pure Rubrical Altar Wines will be cheerfully furnished on request by our California or New York Offices.

ST. JOSEPH'S AGRICULTURAL INSTITUTE

Rutherford, Napa Valley, Cal.—Per Rev. D. O. Crowley

Beaulieu Vineyard
Office: 149 California St., San Francisco, Cal.
Per G. de Latour

Beaulieu Vineyard Distributing Co.
47-49 Barclay St., New York City, N. Y.

Firms with Episcopal Authorization to Handle Sacred Vessels to Repair Them

BALTIMORE:	**JOHN MURPHY CO.**, Park Avenue and Clay Street.
BOSTON:	**BIGELOW KENNARD & CO.**, 511 Washington Street. **THOS. J. FLYNN & CO.**, 62-64 Essex Street. **MATTHEW F. SHEEHAN COMPANY**, 17 and 19 Beach St. **PATRICK J. GILL**, 387 Washington Street.
CHICAGO:	**BENZIGER BROTHERS**, 205-207 W. Washington Street. (Factory in De Kalb Avenue and Rockwell Place, Brooklyn, N. Y.) **JOHN P. DALEIDEN CO.**, 1530-32 Sedgwick Street. **ECCLESIASTICAL GOODS CO.**, 984 Milwaukee Ave. **D. B. HANSEN & SONS**, 27 N. Franklin Street. **MATRE AND COMPANY**, 76 W. Lake Street. **SPAULDING & CO.**, Michigan Avenue and Van Buren St.
CINCINNATI:	**BENZIGER BROTHERS**, 343 Main Street. (Factory in De Kalb Avenue and Rockwell Place, Brooklyn, N. Y.) **FR. PUSTET CO.**, 436 Main Street.
CLEVELAND:	**THE R. A. KOCH CO.**, 1139 Superior Ave. **NORTHERN OHIO PLATING WORKS**, 1501 Columbus Road.
DENVER:	**JAMES CLARKE CHURCH GOODS HOUSE**, 1638-40 Tremont St.
MILWAUKEE:	**BERGS MANUFACTURING CO.**, 483-485 Twenty-seventh Street. **DIEDERICH-SCHAEFER CO.**, 413 Broadway. **A. WERNER**, 649 E. Water Street.
NEW YORK:	**BENZIGER BROTHERS**, 36-38 Barclay Street. (Factory in De Kalb Avenue and Rockwell Place, Brooklyn, N. Y.) **BLASE BENZIGER & CO., INCORPORATED**, 98-100 Park Place. **DREICER & CO.**, 560 Fifth Avenue. **THE FEELEY CO.**, 10 E. 50th Street. **THE GORHAM COMPANY**, 5th Avenue and 36th Street. **P. J. KENEDY & SONS**, 44 Barclay Street. **FR. PUSTET CO.**, 52 Barclay Street.
OMAHA:	**KOLEY AND SON**, 2910 Farnam Street.
PHILADELPHIA:	**H. L. KILNER, & CO.**, 1630 Chestnut Street. **J. J. McDERMOTT**, Room 818, 1011 Chestnut Street. **FRANK A. L. LEAHY**, 1645 North Third Street. **LOUIS J. MEYER, INCORPORATED**, 804 Walnut Street. **F. C. PEQUIGNOT**, 1331 Walnut Street. **A. A. SHAW**, 5813 Windsor Place. **HERMAN J. WOLF**, 539-543 W. Huntingdon Street. **WRIGHT MANUFACTURING CO.**, 133 Master Street.
PITTSBURGH:	**E. J. LETZKUS**, 2006 Jenkins Arcade.
PROVIDENCE:	**W. J. FEELEY CO.**, 169 S. Angell Street. **THE GORHAM COMPANY**, Elmwood. **W. J. SULLIVAN CO.**, 96 Jefferson Street.
SEATTLE:	**THE KAUFER CO.**
ST. LOUIS:	**B. HERDER BOOK CO.**, 17 South Broadway. **MUELLER PLATING CO.**, 920 Pine St., Imperial Bldg.
ST. PAUL:	**E. M. LOHMANN CO.**, 385 St. Peter St.
STEVENS POINT:	**STEVEN WALTER COMPANY**, Stevens Point, Wisconsin.

CONTENTS CONTINUED

ANALECTA:

ACTA PII PP. XI:

De Ordinariorum Facultatibus Quinquennalibus 76

DIARIUM ROMANAE CURIAE:

Recent Pontifical Honors 77

STUDIES AND CONFERENCES:

Our Analecta—Roman Documents for the Month 78

Maryknoll Mission Letters XLII: A Catholic University for South China. (*The Rev. J. E. Walsh, A.F.M., Wuchow, China*) 78

Sacramental Absolution and Pew Rent 83

A Marriage Case 84

Breaking the Eucharistic Fast 86

Another View of the Mixed Marriage Question. (*The Rev. M. V. Kelly, C.S.B., Toronto, Ont., Canada*) 87

Orthodox Teaching on the Sacrifice of the Mass. (*The Right Rev. Alexander MacDonald, D.D., Victoria, B. C., Canada.*) 89

Missionary and Parochial Shepherding 90

Priestly Ministry at the Deathbed 91

Pastoral Duty "ex Caritate" and "ex Justitia" 92

ECCLESIASTICAL LIBRARY TABLE:

Recent Theology. (*The Rev. Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R., Rome, Italy*) .. 95

CRITICISMS AND NOTES:

Coulton: Five Centuries of Religion 100

Ayrinhac: General Legislation in the New Code of Canon Law 104

———: Father Price of Maryknoll 105

Keppler: The Poor Souls in Purgatory 107

Paradise: Jesus Christ and the Spirit of Youth 107

LITERARY CHAT 109

BOOKS RECEIVED 112

THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

SEVENTH SERIES.—VOL. IX.—(LXIX).—JULY, 1923.—NO. 1.

ST. THOMAS AQUINAS—SIXTH CENTENARY.

THE sixteenth day of July, 1923, will mark the six-hundredth anniversary of the canonization of St. Thomas Aquinas by Pope John XXII, forty-nine years after the Angelic Doctor's death. The solemn observance of the anniversary of the canonization will be held for the Universal Church before the close of the present year. Dante, in this sixth centenary celebration, may speak for the world:

> To celebrate so great a paladin
> Have moved me the impassioned courtesy
> And the discreet discourses of Friar Thomas,
> And with me they have moved this company.[1]
>
> * * * * * *
>
> Light intellectual replete with love,
> Love of true good replete with ecstasy,
> Ecstasy that transcendeth every sweetness.[2]

One must marvel at the extraordinary accomplishments of the Angel of the Schools during his comparatively short life of at most forty-nine years.[3] But when one considers the influence which he has exerted, by his works, over the minds of Catholic philosophers, apologists and theologians; when one sees the recognition accorded him in the Councils of Lyons, Vienne, Florence, Trent, and the Vatican; when one watches the Chair of Peter and notes how its occupants have not only been the consistent patrons of St. Thomas, but have given to his words the weight of the teaching authority of the Church;

[1] *Paradiso*, 12, Longfellow.

[2] *Paradiso*, 30, Longfellow.

[3] Biographical authors differ somewhat regarding the precise date of St. Thomas's birth.

when one examines the many dogmatic and moral formulae which have not only the style and flavor of Aquinas but are identical with his formulation; when one attempts to measure the influence of St. Thomas on the "Ecclesia docens"—in short, when one gives even passing attention to the record of his fame, an explanation must be sought in the very special providence of God which raised up the Angel of the Schools "to enlighten the Church by his wonderful learning and to quicken her through his godly labors".[4]

In the light of such considerations the language of the Breviary seems less extravagant: "Doctor of the Church, light of the world, splendor of Italy, virgin shining as the flower of chastity, meriting a double crown of glory . . . citizen of celestial abodes, ornament of the world, leader, light of the faithful, norm, boundary, law of all morals, vase of virtues meriting the reward of life".[5] The Office also applies to him the words of Ecclesiasticus: "The Lord chose him out of all living men. And he gave him power in his commandments, in the convenant of his judgments, that he should teach Jacob his testimonies and give light to Israel in his law."[6]

The Roman Pontiffs measure carefully their words of praise. They are not given to exaggeration. Theirs is the very special and divine commission to safeguard truth, to point out errors, and to prescribe remedies for the moral evils of the world until the end of time. The Vicars of Christ for six hundred years have pointed to Thomas Aquinas, in the words of Leo XIII, as the peerless man and the greatest of teachers . . . far above all other scholastic Doctors, Thomas Aquinas, their Master and Prince".[7]

The greatest genius of the Middle Ages, the highest embodiment of its religious spirit and best interpretation of its inquiring mind, was Aquinas. His life was spent in strengthening the bonds of union between philosophy and Catholic faith, and showing the relations between philosophy and theology. A breaking-down process was begun by the Renaissance and completed by the so-called Reformation. Modern philo-

[4] Office of St. Thomas, Brev. O. P., Prayer.
[5] Ibid., Antiph.
[6] Ibid., Capit.
[7] Leo XIII, *Aeterni Patris.*

sophy has, by degrees, declared an absolute divorce from and expressed its disdain for theology and religion. The philosophy of the hour is separating all the connected parts of the science. It is occupied in issuing questionnaires, cataloguing facts, enumerating the various mental processes, giving the independence of a science to many branches of correlated knowledge rather than generalizing or considering the fixed laws which govern thought, or unifying under general principles the many achievements which modern philosophy in a constructive way has accomplished. The learned world has built a mighty edifice, adorned with all the riches that natural resources and human genius and industry can contribute. But it is a house built upon sand. It has no foundations. The winds and the rains come, and it is destroyed. The scholars proceed to erect another building. They do not seek another architect, another builder, another teacher. They do not examine the foundations. Without Revelation and the elements of the spiritual and the supernatural, no lasting temple can be erected, no enduring and beneficent system of philosophy can be built up.

When we realize that Voltaire's work consisted for the most part of popularizing the false philosophy of his day—a philosophy which undermined the foundations of Christian society in France, and prepared the way for the French Revolution, we may pause to inquire what will be the consequences of the false philosophy now contaminating the intellectual atmosphere in our schools, colleges, and universities, our industrial corporations, and our social and political life in America. Is it not true that most of our thinkers to-day in America are radical? Their radicalism is dangerous because their philosophy is false. They have no contact with the supernatural. Are we doing the most that can be done by the mighty and united effort of the Church? Shall we say that the truths of Christian philosophy cannot be popularized, that they cannot be given in palatable form for the learned? We need but set ourselves to the task by a united effort of the dioceses, the bishops and the priests. A decadence of Scholastic philosophy came about, not because the science had lost anything of its value, but because it had no teachers. If we but prepare the men, we shall undoubtedly get a hearing for Christian philosophy in every

institution of learning; we shall succeed in popularizing its great truths.

Leo XIII was intent on making the restoration of Thomistic philosophy one of the principal purposes of his pontificate. Considering the evils of his times, he attributed them in their last analysis to the "evil teaching about things human and divine that has come forth from the schools of philosophy".[8] Pius X, dealing with the errors of Modernism, confirmed the position of his illustrious predecessor. Benedict XV, guiding the Bark of Peter through the raging sea of evil which the World War lashed into the utmost fury, deemed it opportune to proclaim to the world at a moment when Christian culture, and even civilization itself, seemed threatened with destruction, that he held St. Thomas in the greatest veneration, and ardently loved him and followed his teachings with the greatest exactitude.[9]

Pope Pius XI, a recognized leader of thought, addressing the Roman Academy but recently said of the saint: "Thomas was a true light, worthy of God who brought forth the light . . . the Church has made this light her own; she has intensified it, and with it she has illustrated her own immortal doctrine, especially since that light came forth from the very heart of God . . . We cannot but follow what has been one of the most beautiful and one of the most touching aspirations of our entire life, namely always to recommend to all true friends of faith and science, of natural truth and revealed religion, a loyal adherence to St. Thomas and his teaching." [10] The expected Encyclical of the Sovereign Pontiff on the coming celebration is likely to give us further direction in the employment of Thomistic philosophy.

The sixth centenary will recount in every country the salient characteristics of Aquinas, "the most saintly of learned men and the most learned of the saints". His scholarship will be described in numerous articles, conferences and panegyrics. We shall be told of the liturgical art of the Church, which reached its zenith in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries,

[8] Ibid.

[9] *Summa contra Gentiles,* Ed. Leon, 1918. *Dedicatio.*

[10] Address to the Roman Pontifical Academy of St. Thomas Aquinas, 18 March, 1923.

stimulating many members of the newly-founded religious Orders and recording such names as Marbod, Bishop of Rennes, Peter Abelard, St. Bernard, Adam of St. Victor, Philippe de Grevia, St. Hildegard, Thomas of Celano, Peckham, Archbishop of Canterbury. Whatever be the literary excellence of the hymns of St. Thomas, his name will ever be the most prominent among those who immortalized the hymnody of the Blessed Eucharist. His theme was the loftiest that could have been chosen—God's love for man. "Sacris Solemniis", "Pange Lingua", "Verbum Supernum", "Lauda Sion", prove that the most thoughtful, accurate, and profound theologian who ever penned a poem is their author.

The centenary celebration will call forth pastorals from the episcopacy of the world. The gorgeous ritual of the Church will express its homage to God through the saint whom it is honoring. Universities, colleges, and schools will hail their universal patron. The hierarchy and the clergy, secular and regular, of each nation will in varied measure, and according to the spirit of each country, bring to the attention of the faithful and the world at large the merits of Aquinas and the benefits conferred by him on the Church and civil society.

The genius of the Church in America might seem to demand something practical, something of permanent benefit, from this centenary record of the canonization of St. Thomas.

One might venture the hope that through it the Angelic Doctor, as a philosopher, may become better known in the United States. Opponents of St. Thomas have said that he is greater as a philosopher than as a theologian, that he lays too much stress on the natural order, that he is not sufficiently supernatural. It is now understood that these charges are without foundation; but the very objections made against him in the past can now be made to serve the cause of truth by getting the Angelic Doctor a hearing.

The philosophy of St. Thomas merits the assiduous study of our young clergy. This, however, demands time and attention to Scholastic philosophy by way of preparation. Our philosophical students often seem mystified by the system. Many who get down to its serious study make it too much a work of memory. Preceptors too often lose sight of the necessity of developing the imagination, especially in the younger students,

simultaneously with the faculty of the intellect. Without the harmonious development of imagination and intellect, resourcefulness in the priesthood for the advancement of the Church and the salvation of souls is not likely to be acquired. The true purpose of philosophy is to make the students think by ascertaining the causes of things, and by the application of their philosophy to the every-day problems of the Church and of their priestly lives. Classes in philosophy may be made thoroughly interesting by giving students at least some remote insight into the application of philosophy in their subsequent studies in theology. Thus their minds will be quickened to see the advantage of discussing questions from a philosophical standpoint, not merely by the formal Scholastic disputations, but especially by assembling arguments and answering objections, as they will be called upon to do in public lectures and in the work of their apostolic ministry. The routine work, the memory work, of the philosophy classes, the writing of papers which are more or less literal translations of Latin text books, leaving the mind of the student mystified and unresourceful, has proved in most cases to be a failure. Our students must be led to take up theology with a genuine curiosity and a deep love for knowledge. This may be effected by taking measures to change our methods of teaching philosophy. The student who is not brought back in every treatise of theology to refresh his mind with philosophical principles cannot hope to have a thorough grasp of theology.

A valuable aid toward rousing interest in our students and toward giving them encouragement in their philosophical and theological studies might be seminary publications, the articles to be written by seminarians only, and the subjects restricted to those treated in the course of each scholastic year. Such publications would really be *pro MSS.*, and would not go beyond seminary circles. They should prove a bond of union between our Seminaries and the various Houses of Study, and become a stimulus for further efforts in writing to both students and professors.

It is needless to point out that the philosophy taught in our secular colleges and universities is frequently false and dangerous. Many Catholics in professional life who have either lost their faith or given up its practice have done so because

of the superficial philosophy they learned and the un-Christian atmosphere they breathed during their student days. The false is neither more powerful nor more attractive than that which is true. But we must learn from David to seize the weapon from the hand of the enemy. We must, like the resourceful St. Paul, adroitly turn a chance inscription into an argument for the faith. We can never make peace with the philosophical thought of our secular colleges and universities. If Albertus Magnus, Thomas Aquinas, and Bonaventure succeeded first in getting a hearing, then gaining the mastery, in the universities of Paris, Cologne, and Bologna, we certainly can succeed in preparing Catholic laymen who, after a profound study of Christian philosophy, will attain eminence in the philosophical world, and in our great centres of learning be able to combat effectively by the spoken and written word the false philosophy which is giving our American youth a wrong outlook on life. Our laymen will get a hearing if they be but well equipped for their mission. We may have to prepare a hundred men to secure a half-dozen who will give evidence of genius in their philosophical work and who will dedicate their lives to service in the temple of Christian philosophy. It will be worth while to prepare the six; the other ninety-four will render a higher service to religion and to society because of their philosophical training, even though they fail to attain eminence.

Our laymen in every walk of professional life need Christian philosophy. Has it not come to the time when we shall have to put on "drives" for vocations to the medical and legal professions, as well as for the priesthood? What evils are abroad to-day because our business men and our industrial corporations are either ignorant of, or unwilling to accept, the principles of Christian philosophy! We see the lack of it in our legislators. The cleavage between capital and labor can be bridged by Christian philosophy. Both capitalists and labor organizations would do well to train men in true Christian philosophy. Neither group is apt to take the initiative in this, unless the Church induce both to undertake a long, constructive piece of work which would go far toward offering a real solution.

The secular press generally ignores the principles of Christian philosophy. We want a free press, but not one which fails to recognize that its liberty, like that of the individual and the State, is a perfecting and elevating power. The so-called Liberal press presents its un-Christian theories and programs to the educated classes with a force that is gripping and ensnaring to those who have never studied Christian philosophy. Its appeal is to the intellect through superficial brilliancy and plausible arguments.

In many of our Catholic schools we are doing routine work in teaching Christian philosophy, without preparing laymen for distinguished leadership in every walk of public life. Would it not be worthy of our best thought and deserving of our most serious and united efforts to give to the United States, in the near future, a number of laymen who will be the outstanding figures in their professions and in the nation; men who will have a comprehensive and profound grasp of Christian philosophy and who will know its application to every-day problems? How to begin, how to work out a plan which will be accorded general approval and support, how to persevere under many failures and how to attain ultimate success —these are matters not easy to determine. But resources to carry out such a plan would not be lacking. It would lead to a practical achievement suggested by the sixth centenary of the canonization of our greatest Catholic philosopher.

St. Thomas as an apologist is calling on us to take advantage of opportunities unparalleled in all the Christian centuries. The work cannot be done by slogans, such as "Make America Catholic." These merely irritate and arouse bigotry, suggesting to our opponents that the gigantic organization of the Catholic Church is being put into operation to bring about Roman domination in America. The constructive methods of St. Thomas—his thorough comprehension of his subject, his masterly synthesis and analysis of the errors of his time, his modesty and courtesy in dealing with an opponent, all of which commanded the attention and respect of the learned world, his ready compliance with the request of authority in preparing his immortal *Summa contra Gentiles*—commend themselves to us for our guidance in bringing the fundamental truths of religion to the tens of millions who are possible converts to

the faith. If we deplore the fact that sixty or seventy millions of our fellow citizens are recorded as indifferent to all religion, we must not lose sight of the fact that it may be complimentary to the intelligence of these sixty or seventy millions that they have rejected the hundreds of man-made religions, with all their absurdities and contradictions. Among these millions are many who are sincerely religious-minded. Many are in search of something which indifferentism can never give them. Many have what seem, without the grace of God, insuperable prejudices to overcome before they can consider the claims of the Catholic Church. The majority would probably accept most of our fundamental doctrines if they could be brought to consider them, especially if they did not at first recognize them as Catholic doctrines.

The religious errors and the false religions of the United States need to be understood in their sources and their effects. This study cannot be made from books and the so-called codes of their religious beliefs. The sects are elusive, changing, "liberal", with the idea that liberal religion means no fixed and unchangeable truths, but rather a record of progress which runs parallel with progress of the material order, and which records the infinite variety of mental processes by which God is sought. There are no profound subtleties in the religious errors of the various sects. The real difficulty in the preparation of a record of American Religious Errors lies in ascertaining the latest phase of the errors, and to offer some help to the students by which they would be enabled to understand and to be patiently sympathetic with the souls who are to be led from error to the truth. Our young priests are not asked to convert Arians or Manicheans; but they should be prepared to combat the religious errors of those living within the territorial limits of their parishes or missions, and be fired with zeal to bring the truths of our divine religion to every misguided soul within the sphere of their influence. By studying the false teaching and also the methods of the sects, for the defence of the true religion, we learn to use the very weapons of error to great advantage in the cause of truth.

The apologist needs to be resourceful and tactful, not antagonizing non-Catholics, but skilfully arousing their interest to the point where they will be impelled to inquire into the claims

of the Catholic Church. Apologetics is a most fascinating study in our Seminaries and our Houses of Study. If we have failed to use it properly, let us recognize frankly the fact and correct our methods. It is gratifying to see the large number of converts made each year; but if apologetics meant what it should, considering our opportunities, we would in all likelihood have, yearly, four times the number of converts now recorded.

The possibilities of a publication devoted exclusively, or in large part, to apologetics; the necessity of laying stress on apologetics in our seminaries as a supplementary course, or in the last year of theology; the demand that the errors of all the various sects in the United States be studied, the false principles common to many or all of them classified, the methods of their activity recorded—all these things seem worthy of serious consideration. The Angelic Doctor teaches us how to study errors, how to analyze them, how to prepare a synthesis of them, and how to arrest the attention of those who have been drawn into them or attracted to them. He is the model teacher who gives us norms that cannot be improved upon. The practical character of the American Catholic mind should find ways and means of giving apologetics in our country the place of importance which it deserves. This can be one of the permanent results suggested by the sixth centenary of the canonization of St. Thomas.

JOHN T. MCNICHOLAS,
Bishop of Duluth.

SAINT THOMAS THE THINKER.

ONE comes to understand the thinker in Thomas the man and the Saint in proportion as by imagination and by sympathy with his character and ideals one succeeds in getting inside his consciousness and in looking out through his eyes upon the object-world as he took it in and as he unfolded and expounded in his writings what he saw. This inner contact of the student with the teacher is, of course, a condition *sine qua non* for the understanding of any teaching. Even nature exacts as much from her pupils. Those alone whose "eyes are pure" find in every creature "a looking-glass of holy

doctrine." It is to him only "who in the love of nature holds communion with her visible forms" that she speaks "her various language, having for his gayer hours"

> A voice of gladness, and a smile
> And an eloquence of beauty, gliding
> Into his darker musings with a mild
> And healing sympathy, that steals away
> Their sharpness ere he is aware.

It is owing to the lack of this inner touch and sympathy with the soul of the Scholastic Doctors (amongst whom Aquinas stands easily first) that almost every attempt of non-Catholic writers to interpret them results in failure. Indeed many of those who share with St. Thomas a common faith and even possess some more or less complete knowledge of the Aristotelian system upon which he built his own, or rather which he worked up into the very tissue of his philosophy—many, I say, who bring to the study of the Angelic Doctor's writings genuine doctrinal preparedness, nevertheless fail to comprehend them because their minds are preoccupied with the structure, the materials, the mechanism, and not with the life, which was the soul of the builder. They are like school boys who parse the Prince of Denmark and find no Hamlet; like laboratorians who chemicize the rose and miss the bloom; like philosophers who reduce the world to electrons and motion and discover neither the Author nor the purpose of it.

It cannot be too strongly emphasized that the *Summa* was a life before it became a system. St. Thomas as a thinker was essentially a contemplative. He had intimate experience of God before and whilst he wrote. Like "Hierotheus doctus", whom he mentions Dionysius as quoting, "erat non solum discens sed et patiens divina".[1] Recognizing himself as called to be *Catholicae* (i. e. universalis) *veritatis doctor*, and a teacher whose duty it was not only to instruct the advanced ("provectos instruere") but also to educate beginners, he felt that he had, like the tender-souled Paul, "to give to the little ones in Christ milk not solid meat". So he set himself the task of explaining simply and clearly the truths of religion "eo modo quo congruit ad eruditionem incipientium".[2]

[1] I, Qu. 1, a. vi.
[2] Prologus in Summam.

St. Thomas is of course universally recognized to be an intellectualist. And this in theory as well as in practice. The intellect he holds to be man's highest faculty. Logically and naturally its action must precede that of the will. "Nil volitum quin praecognitum." In its operation man attains the first essential constituent of his ultimate end and complete perfection in the Beatific Vision.

No one, as Dr. William Barry observes,[3] has portrayed Thomas the thinker, the intellectualist, more vividly than Dean Milman. The entire portrayal might with advantage be quoted here. The following passage however must suffice. St. Thomas, he says,

> approaches more nearly than most philosophers, certainly than most divines, to pure embodied intellect. He is perfectly passionless; he has no polemic indignation, nothing of the churchman's jealousy and suspicion: he has no fear of the result of any investigation; he hates nothing, hardly heresy; he loves nothing, unless perhaps naked, abstract truth. In his serene confidence that all must end in good, he moves the most startling and even perilous questions, as if it were the most indifferent, the very Being of God. God must be revealed by syllogistic process. Himself inwardly conscious of the absolute harmony of his own intellectual and moral being, he places sin not so much in the will as in the understanding. The perfection of man is the perfection of his intelligence. He examines with the same perfect self-command, it might almost be said apathy, the converse as well as the proof of the most vital religious truths. He is nearly as consummate a sceptic, almost atheist, as he is a divine and theologian. Secure, as it should seem, in impenetrable armor, he has not only no apprehension, but seems not to suppose the possibility of danger; he has nothing of the boastfulness of self-confidence, but in calm assurance of victory, gives every advantage to his adversary. On both sides of every question he casts the argument into one of his clear, distinct syllogisms, and calmly places himself as Arbiter, and passes judgment in one or a series of still more unanwerable syllogisms. He has assigned its inassailable province to Church authority, to tradition or the Fathers, faith and works; but beyond, within the proper sphere of philosophy, he asserts full freedom. There is no Father, even St. Augustine, who may not be examined by the fearless intellect.[4]

[3] *Dublin Review*, Oct. 1922.

[4] *History of Latin Christianity*. By Henry Hart Milman, D.D. Third edition, Vol. IX, pp. 132-133.

All of this and the rest of Dr. Milman's context is obviously as true as it is well said. On the other hand, if one were to infer from the estimate that Aquinas even as a thinker was merely an intellectualist he would make a great mistake. In almost every article of the *Summa*, whereof there are 3120, indeed in almost every objection, whereof there are 10,000, one notices touches of feeling and will, acts, habits, which, while they urge the specific functions of the intellect, are kept in the background; not held in quiescence but in perfect subservience to the purely intellectual ideal of the "universalis veritatis doctor". An obvious instance may be seen in the Saint's treatment of the Question (Ia Iae, vi), "Whether sacred doctrine (theology) is wisdom." After proving the affirmative answer by an argument which is as lucid as it is profound and cogent, he puts to himself this objection: "Sacred doctrine is acquired by *study*. But wisdom is given by *infusion*; since it is one of the gifts of the Holy Ghost.—Therefore." In his answer the Saint distinguishes two modes of judging of things: the first proceeds by the way of *inclination*; just as a person who possesses a habit of virtue estimates aright objects that fall within its sphere, since his mind is urged thereto by the active quality of the virtue itself; the second process is by way of intellectual *cognition*; just as a person instructed in moral science may judge rightly of the actions of a virtue, even though he do not possess the virtuous habit. Judgment by *inclination* belongs to the wisdom which is the gift of the Holy Ghost; judgment by *cognition* belongs to the wisdom which is theology. Whence the unfortunate fact that the theologian is not necessarily a good man, even as the good man is not necessarily a theologian. Not so however in the case of Aquinas. Unmistakably the student realizes that in the intellect back of the *Summa* are intimately associated the wisdom that descends from the Father of Lights with the intellectual habit which on its purely natural side is metaphysics and on the side of its revealed principles is theology. On the other hand, while the two habits conjoin in the building of the *Summa*, the distinction between the two is never left out of sight. Like the light and the heat in the sunbeams they come together, but are not identical. They differ in their wave lengths and their intensity. The profound intuitive power of

his intellect, which as much as the purity of his heart merited for Thomas the title "Angelic Doctor," is the analogue of his supernatural wisdom. The strength and perfect consecutiveness of his reasoning, which merited for him the title "Expositor" (of Aristotle), was the basis and the instrument of his acquired wisdom (theology). His intuitive insight was so quick, profound, and sure, that it very largely did away with the necessity of the reasoning process. Yet even in his perfect intelligence there is a line of demarcation of the two processes—a difference of degree that becomes more obvious when it is projected into the external order of things. Take for instance the theistic thesis, expressed interrogatively by *Utrum Deus sit?* Is not this an intuitive proposition? Is not *est* (existence), the predicate, the essential constituent of the subject, *God?* Yes, says our profound intuitionist, the subject *de facto* does contain the predicate; the proposition—*God is*—is "per se nota quoad se". And yet the human mind has no intuition of the fact; the proposition is not "per se nota quoad nos". The existence of God needs to be proved by a process of ratiocination. And straightway Thomas proceeds to prove it by a fivefold chain of argumentation not one link of which has been shown to be incapable of supporting the weight entrusted to it, although practically all non-Catholic philosophers from Kant to Spencer and their recent followers, have striven to prove that either all (or at least one or other) of the theistic arguments put forward by Aquinas, in the wake of the Stagyrite, are inconclusive.

For the rest, if you seek further illustration of the union in distinction of intuition and reasoning, as these processes are associated in the mind of the Angelic Doctor, take up the *Tria Principia*, by Fr. Reginald, O.P.[5] With an insight hardly less penetrating and a power of reasoning hardly less sustained than were these conjoined qualities operative in the mind of the Angelical, this his worthy disciple reduces the whole philosophy and theology of the Master to the three axioms: 1. *Ens est transcendens*; 2. *Deus est actus purus*; 3. *Absoluta specificantur a se, relativa ab alio.* Three empty platitudes, you may say; and so it seems. But follow Fr. Reginald as by

[5] *Doctrinae D. Thomae Aq. Tria Principia*, Paris, Lethielleux.

intuition reënforced by continuous ratiocination, he shows step by step that the whole of Thomistic Ontology and Psychology are implicit in the transcendency of being; and the whole of Thomistic Theology is found virtually contained in the principle, *Deus est actus purus.* Unfortunately Fr. Reginald did not live to develop the third principle from which he purposed deducing the Moral Theology of the *Summa.*

We need not, however, go outside the works themselves of St. Thomas for illustrations of his thought-power. With due allowance for the figurativeness of the well known, and highly authoritative saying, that "every article of the *Summa* is a miracle," few students of the master work would hesitate to give a certain literalness to the term when applied to that monument *aere perennius* as a whole. Nor will any one who makes a thorough study of the *Contra Gentiles,* especially if he take that erudite and keenly critical commentator Fr. Silvester Ferrariensis as a guide, hesitate to apply to that *opus magnum* the epithet "mirum si non miraculum." We are not here concerned with the objective doctrine of either of these works, but simply with the thought-power that built and pervades them.[6]

The subject matter falls into four books treating respectively (1) of God; (2) Creation—the outgoing from God of the world and man; (3) God as the final end—the return to God; (4) the Trinity, Incarnation, the Sacraments, and the *Novissima.* From the first to the last of the 750 chapters under which the topics are elaborated there is a tissue of consecutive reasoning as closely woven and intimately vitalized as the organism of a tree. Outside of Euclid's Geometry and the *Tria Principia* mentioned above it would be difficult to find anywhere an example of insight so profound and of reasoning so sustained as that which is furnished by the *Summa Philosophica Contra Gentiles.* The work, being overshadowed by the *Summa Theologica,* does not receive the attention of our students that it deserves. The University of Oxford in 1902 placed he book on the list of subjects which a candidate for Final Honors in the School of Literae Humaniores is free to

[6] The *Contra Gentiles* is printed in the Parma edition of the *Opera Omnia* in a small folio volume of about 400 double-column pages.

chose. This fact, which is further facilitated by Fr. Joseph Rickaby's excellent English translation, may help to make the *Contra Gentiles* more widely studied.

Unfortunately, Saint Thomas left no epistolary correspondence laying bare the movements of his mind. However, there is just one short letter which is worth a volume in revealing the concrete setting and the urge of his thought-power. Some dear little novice named John, wishing really to progress in his theology (and moved by no autographic impulse), wrote to the illustrious Angel of the Schools for advice on methods of study. St. Thomas, with that delicate charity which made him readily respond to every demand on his time and energy, sits down and writes—a treatise on theological pedagogics? No, but a brief epistle wherein is summed up more practical wisdom than can be gathered from many of our contemporary volumes on the Psychology of Education. "Don't be in a hurry," he tells Joannes, "to launch your boat into the deep; sail out by the rivers—*per faciliora ad difficiliora oportet devenire.* Be slow to speak; preserve purity of conscience: fail not to pray: love to frequent your cell, if you would be led into the *cellam vinariam*; show yourself amiable to everybody; busy yourself in no wise with the doings of others; be not over familiar with anybody, since familiarity breeds contempt and withdraws the mind from study; shun mental dissipation (*discursus super omnia fugias*); walk in the footsteps of the good and the godly; don't mind from whom you hear a good thing; whatever is good fasten it in your memory; don't aspire to what is beyond your reach; *altiora te ne quaesieris.*" These are the larger nuggets of pedagogical wisdom which the supreme teacher sends to the eager novice, little John. But what have these things to do with the thought-power of the Angelic Doctor? Just this, that they are abstracts from the inner conditions of that power.

To get closer to the source from which that power sprang we must ascend the mount of Cassino. Thither was Thomas sent by his parents when he was five, to be educated. Sprung from the imperial blood of Germany and the kingly stock of Spain, the boy had inherited a sound body encasing a sound mind. The pure heart of the child and his naturally receptive imagination and alert intelligence, quickened by the matchless

beauty of the scene that unrolled itself from the Appenines to the Mediterranean on the West and to the Adriatic on the East, were ready for the cultivation which the saintly and scholarly sons of Benedict were eager to impart. That God was the All-Father and the Creator of the mighty mountains and the dense forests, the wide plains, the far-away waters, the over-arching sky, the sun that by day moved from sea to sea and the stars that by night shone out in the deep Italian sky—these and the other truths of Christian Faith mastered the mind of the angelic child. The primal truth of God's existence, His wisdom, power, love, and ubiquity grasped the very roots of his being. Who is God?—*quis esset Deus*?—was the query that haunted him, that was habitually on his lips and presaged the character of his lifework. Cardinal Newman tells us in the *Apologia* that God and himself were the supreme masters of his habitual consciousness; that the existence of his own self was not more imperative to his mind than the abiding presence of God. The same is true of Saint Thomas. The realization of God within and without was more absorbing than the consciousness of his own being. The boy became possessed of this idea on the mountain of Cassino and it flooded his soul and saturated his thought-power. Thenceforward his intellectual development consisted in the reaction of his mind to that supreme idea until the vast organic synthesis wherein the Creator and the creature are seen in all their magnificent wonderfulness of cause and effect, of tendency and finality, stood out within him.

Long before the *Summa* was constructed, however, its roots and trunk and branch were in the mind of Thomas, not simply in its organized outline and the coördination of its members, but as a living experience. The mind, the soul-life of Thomas, was in it and through it. The thought-power that was to be spent in its construction was gradually and most carefully trained for the work. Two incidents contributed markedly to this training. During the two years of imprisonment in the Castle of Rocca Secca overlooking Aquino, where his parents had him detained to prevent him from following his intention of entering the Order of St. Dominic, Thomas read and probably committed to memory the *Metaphysics* of Aristotle and the Bible; copies of which two works he had managed to

obtain through the ready connivance of a loving sister. Study of the *Metaphysics* (his mind having been previously drilled by the trivium and cultured by the quadrivium which he had made with the Dominicans at Naples) informed and deepened his intellect in fundamental "wisdom" and prepared him for his later important work: his *Commentaries* on the other writings of the Stagyrite; while the mastery of the Bible supplied his mind with that rich material for proof and illustration which pervades every page of the *Summa*, and practically all his other writings. So numerous are the Scriptural citations that the mere index of them occupies eighty-three closely packed columns of the Migne edition.

The other incident that contributed fundamentally to the development of his intellectual power was the victory he gained over the vile temptress whom his unworthy, despicable brother had sent to Rocca Secca to rob him of his virtue and thus frustrate his religious vocation. After this triumph he had a vision wherein he saw two angels girding his loins. Thereafter, as he told his *socius* Reginald, he never experienced the slightest motion of concupiscence. Thus completely freed from the disturbances of sensuality, he possessed his soul in peace and was able to centre the whole power of his mind upon whatever subject claimed his attention; and pure of heart he saw God not simply through the abstractive and inferential processes that form the systematic mechanism of the *Summa*, but in that immediate contemplative intuition which students who get beyond the mechanism of expression into the life of the Angelic thinker feel to have conditioned and actuated its construction. The incidents which his biographers narrate in illustration of the Angelical's power of mental concentration (such as his ability to dictate simultaneously to two secretaries, and his absorption in the problem that led him to cry out with the *actum est de Manichaeis*, the while he struck the table, at the king's banquet) are too well known to require repetition.

The work which more than any other of his voluminous writings reveals Thomas the Thinker, is, it need hardly be said, the *Summa Theologica*.[7] His biographers and commen-

[7] It is impossible to say when St. Thomas began the *Summa*. The *Prima Pars*

tators have exhausted all the similes suggested by nature and art in their efforts to describe the magnitude and perfection of this masterpiece; and have had in the end to confess their impotence. It is only by intimate and prolonged study of the text and with the aid of the Cajetanian commentaries that one comes to realize that these superlative laudations are like the efforts of a traveller who, having beheld some exhibition of nature's mingled sublimity and beauty, would fain give his stay-at-home friends an idea of the scene and impart to them a share in his enthusiastic admiration. Painfully he has to realize the futility of the attempt. "Go and see it: seeing is believing"—is the peroration of his hopeless eloquence.

The mind of the Angelical had been prepared by thirty and more years of study, teaching, and preaching for its lifework. In a memory that seems to have lost nothing of truth-value that had been entrusted to it, were stored up the wealth of Sacred Scripture, ecclesiastical tradition, and patristic doctrine. The wisdom of the Greeks, especially the teachings of Plato and the Platonists, of Aristotle and his commentators, he had made thoroughly his own. In a word, there was at his control the aggregate knowledge of the past—inspired, theological, philosophical, and (so far as the empirical and historical limits of his day allowed) also scientific. On these accumulations he drew with a sure power of discrimination, a fine instinct of adaptation, and with an unerring estimate of their intrinsic truth and relative values. The thought-power which this incomparable temple of the mind reveals is in the first place the comprehensive grasp it manifests of God's plan of self-revelation, and in the second place the profound penetration into the inmost details of that plan as they are expressed in Creation and Restoration—the coöperating activities of synthesis and analysis which the structure of the *Summa* reflects from the mind of its architect and builder.[8] When he had reached about

and the *Prima Secundae* were written between 1265-69, when the author was probably forty. The *Secunda Secundae* was issued in 1271, and the *Tertia Pars* as far as the nineteenth question (De Poenitentia). The *Supplement* was probably added by Fr. Reginald de Piperno.

[8] With his charming sincerity he had once answered the question as to what he considered the greatest gift God had bestowed upon him: "I think it is that of comprehending whatsoever I read." And to another query (childish it seems to the sophisticated), whether he would not like to own the beautiful city of Paris, seeing how much good he could do with such wealth: "Rather would I have Chrysostom's *Homilies on Matthew*", was the reply.

the middle of the *Third Part*, Thomas laid down his pen and ceased dictating to his eager scribes. Fr. Reginald, his *carissimus socius*, urged him to add the finishing crown to the monument. But Thomas told him under the seal of secrecy that the light of eternal truth that had flooded his soul made it impossible to continue the processes of mechanical construction. "I cannot, Reginald, for everything that I have written seems to me as chaff."

The present brief tribute may fittingly close with the following edifying incident as given by Tocco, quoting the Bull of Canonization. "Whilst Thomas was praying, according to his custom, in the church at Naples, B. Romanus, whom he had left in Paris as Master of Theology, stood before him. St. Thomas approached his friend and said: 'Welcome here! When did you arrive?'—'I have passed from this life,' replied the figure, 'and am permitted to appear on your account.' Overcome by the apparition for a moment, then collecting himself, the Angelical said: 'In the name of God, then, I adjure you to answer me these questions: How do I stand? and are my works pleasing to God?'—'Thou art in a good state, and thy works do please God,' was the reply. Then, 'What about yourself?' inquired the Angelical. 'I am now in eternal life,' answered Romanus, 'but I have been in Purgatory.'—'Tell me,' continued St. Thomas, 'the answer to the question which we have so frequently discussed, *Whether the habits which are acquired in this life remain with us in Heaven*?'—'Brother Thomas,' replied Romanus, 'I see God, and do not ask me more.'—'How do you see God?' rejoined the Saint. 'Do you see him immediately, or by means of some similitude?'—The other answered: 'As we have heard, so have we seen, in the city of the Lord of Hosts!' and then instantly vanished." [9]

On several occasions the Angelic Doctor is declared by the same authority to have received heavenly confirmation of his work. The case when the word came from the Crucifix, "Bene scripsisti de me, Thoma," is known to everybody. Perhaps less familiar is the incident which the Bull of Canonization quoted by Tocco mentions as having occurred in Paris.

[9] Cf. Vaughan, *Saint Thomas of Aquin*, vol. 2, p. 914.

Thomas had been requested to settle a dispute that waged fiercely *inter Doctores* concerning the position of the "accidents" in the Blessed Sacrament. Having prayed and fasted and written out his opinion, the Angelical in the simplicity of his faith begged his Master on the altar for a sign whereby he might know whether he had written aright. A voice from the tabernacle was heard by the whole assembled community declaring: "Bene de hoc sacramento scripsisti, Thoma, et bene determinasti propositam quaestionem, quantum in corpore adhuc mortali constitutus quispiam possit, et humanitate diffiniri."

These are extrinsic testimonies to the thought-power of the Angelic Doctor, evincing not so much its breadth and its depth as (what is infinitely more important) its truth, its conformity with the Supreme Truth to which, as *veritatis Catholicae doctor*, he strove to introduce the little ones in Christ.

F. P. SIEGFRIED.

Overbrook Seminary, Pa.

CLASSROOM DISEASE AND THE SCHOLASTIC PRESCRIPTION.

IT may with safety be said that most of our American priests devote a substantial part of their energies to the work of Catholic education. Press and pulpit ring periodically with their defence of this glory of the teaching office, and for many a parish priest a flourishing little parochial school is the apple of his pastoral eye. "Every Catholic child in a Catholic school" has been always an instinct with us, even apart from the Church's legislation on the subject; and we may be pardoned a measure of pride in the efficiency already reached by our institutions, primary, secondary, university—an efficiency which a bitter post-bellum opposition has only served to emphasize.

The zeal of our priest in the field of education is surely well fortified with *reasons* for his faith. We know that in our sermons and talks to parents we need not stop with the argument from religion: "Send him to a school where he will hear of God and the Church". For daily experience makes it clear that the case for the Catholic school is not pleaded when we have fastened the epithet of "godless" upon

its competitors. We have something to offer our pupils besides a Christian atmosphere and the devotion of Christian teachers. Religion is indeed the ultimate reason for our undertaking the business of teaching at all. But it does not explain why the Sisters' boys can spell as well as, if not better than their neighbors of the public school, or why the Catholic college graduate acquits himself so well in public speaking. The instruments we use in teaching, if we neglect the relatively short period devoted formally to Christian Doctrine and Evidences of Religion, are purely *natural* ones, just as they are in the public school around the corner. It is precisely upon our selection and handling of the most suitable natural instruments and methods that we must found our claims to recognition as competent educators.

Few of us, however, if we are to judge from our silence on the subject, are keenly aware of the debt we owe to Saint Thomas in this very province of education. We have been reared in an atmosphere permeated and controlled by his psychology; we are products of seminaries where the Scholastic perspective gave us a natural introduction to the social end of parochial work. We have absorbed the spirit of Aquinas, but all unknowingly, and it often requires a keen analysis of history and method to bring home to ourselves how the genius of Scholasticism runs like a beautiful curve through the Gothic unit of Catholic education, from the grammar grades of parochial school to the doors of the university.

The self-confessed bankruptcy of the secular "system" should effectively remind our priests of the treasure we possess in the Scholastic philosophy of education, and incline us besides to advertise it from pulpit and rectory as occasion offers, and the capacity of our hearers will allow. To the readers of THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, then, the article which follows, on Scholasticism and Mental Discipline—the fundamental point at which we are at odds with most non-Catholic educators—is offered in the hope that it may help to increase our "class-consciousness" as children of the Angelic, *corde et anima*.

I.

If there is one branch of critical science at which the modern pen has become especially adept and voluble, it is that of "placing the blame". The development of this field of literature has connotations which console, and some few which counsel humility. It argues, first of all, a frank recognition of mistakes that have been made, with a wholesome desire to profit by them and to guard against their repetition. We Americans in particular are quick to see "problems", even in their formation, and are not ashamed to acknowledge even national blunders. On the other hand, the multiplicity and fundamental character of these acknowledged problems admit also of a deduction not quite so complimentary: we reflect in our mature years the picture that is often painted of the American boy—he is sincere, lovable, and frightfully rash. Discernment were more properly applied before an election is made, than reserved until the damage has been done, when it can don the virtuous garb of repentance.

Few things are more common nowadays than magazine-confessions of the fad-ridden state of our civilization; but too often the blame is placed on this or that particular isolated fact, which points to an origin, not to an explanation. Deeper than the historian or the newspaper may probe lies the *philosophy* of the fad, the vision of the fad in its causes; and here we stand convicted of all the crimes concomitant with impulsiveness: haste, impressionability, softness of intellect and will. The plain truth is that the precious word *discipline* has gone out of our lives.

In no department, perhaps, may we be better served with illustrations of this truth than in that of education. Present-day classroom conditions are simply chaotic and we are too sincere to deny it, even if the tested product were not being rejected too often for comfort in the business and social world. But the eager young student gets scant profit from the fact that his professor or principal is a penitent. Youth's interests demand a well-reasoned remedy for the fads and experiments that beset its path to real education. Sane thinking is what *this* problem wants, and wants more urgently than any other, because on its solution hangs that of a dozen collateral questions; for the child is the rough fabric of our national life.

But sane thinking is just what this problem is not receiving, and that for a very good reason. Every educator must turn to the philosopher for his starting principles, will he or no; and the modern educator can get no sane principles from the anomaly we call the modern philosopher. We must ask of our educational system three essentials that we look for in every science: first, a clear perception of the end in view; second, an appreciation of its function and exact position in the broad field of human endeavor; third, a method of application outlined and directed by the end and the nature of the subject under training. Of these three determinants the last only is in the control of the pedagogue; the first two must be placed in his hands by the philosopher.

Modern philosophy has no consistent definition to offer of the aim of education, because its outlook on *life* is incomplete and disordered. Its *Weltanschauung* asks the absurd permission of prescinding from the spiritual element in human nature, and from a life beyond the grave; it hides its purely material ideals behind such vague abstractions as "an introduction to society", "war and peace", "training in the proprieties", "arming for citizenship", etc. We have practical unanimity on the score of "preparation for life", but there are as many imperfect notions of *life* as there are colors to the thousand and one philosophical spectra. We do wrong to expect sensible, workable means from a giant system that has no clearly-defined goal in view. "Magni passus, sed extra viam."

The indictment is not an unjust one. Our College Presidents are among the first to complain of hazy aims and concepts all along the educational line of march. Witness the frank admission of Doctor Meiklejohn of Amherst, published recently in *The New Republic*: "The essential fact is that we, the teachers, have no philosophy. We are the devotees of 'subjects' . . . If teachers think in fragments, they cannot teach in whole. . . . Devices of teaching technique will never remedy defects of thought. . . . All that a teacher has to give is just his way of thinking about the world. . . . Out of the turmoil and confusion of this present time our minds must seek, are seeking order and meaning." [1] Seconding his re-

[1] Supplement to issue of 25 October, 1922; art.: "Unity of the Curriculum".

marks we find in the same periodical these of Professor H. B. Alexander of the University of Nebraska: "All over America there is a demand that the colleges justify themselves, and the chaotic and much-pillaged liberal college is the first target, for the very reason that its purpose is ill-defined and ill-understood from within and from without." [2] Later we are told by the same reputable authority that our colleges are "choked with apparatus" and that their elective curricula resemble "an elaborate menu in an unknown tongue". Hon. Charles E. Hughes, our accomplished Secretary of State, has not hesitated to designate a certain variety of American schools as homes of "intellectual vagrancy"—a well-drawn caricature of a system with nothing particular in view.

Much less are we to look for a correct analysis of the nature of the mind, the teacher's sacred working-ground, from a philosophy which has not unhappily been called "the pathology of human reason". Indeed, we might have argued from uncertainty of aim in education to a corresponding ignorance of the real character of the subject of education. The final cause of all beings, rational and otherwise, is infallibly determined by a correct evaluation of their tendencies. Modern philosophy fails when we ask these data of its researches. The gospel of liberalism is the gospel of pride, but one of its tenets is really destructive of all that the rationalist holds dear: it is that irreverence for our very human nature which manifests itself in a distrust of the powers of the intellect (Idealism, Scepticism) and in the voting down of the crown of the *dotes* of man, the freedom of his will (Determinism). No teacher can educate a child he does not know, even were his object in teaching plainly defined; and modern philosophy can give him no introduction to his pupil, because it has blinded itself to common sense and—sacrilege of sacrileges!—has lost its reverence for the rarest handiwork of God, the soul of His child.

If freedom is a fact of experience,[3] the justification of all law, and the perfection of our intellectual life, why must our psychology confine itself almost exclusively to a series of re-

[2] Ibid.; art.: "The College at the Cross Roads".

[3] *Summa Theologica*, I, qu. 83; Lib. 2 Poster. lect. 7.

action tests, and a conglomerate of classroom statistics that make of the child little more than a sensitive machine? Why must we allow Professor James in his *Talks to Teachers* to set him side by side with the animal by calling him simply "an organized group of tendencies to conduct"? And if truth and certitude are facts, without which life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness can be but mockeries, how can we suffer the same William James to teach our children and our children's teachers that "no philosophy can be more than a hypothesis"?[4]

It seems fairly well established, then, that modern philosophy has made a chaos of modern education. But we have said that our teachers and our people would never have been so effectually duped were it not for the philosophy of the fad at the bottom. If the pupil of yesterday had been trained to the discernment that subjects novelties to the stern critique of principle, the educator of to-day would not be tracing present pedagogical follies back to the circumstance "that Charles William Eliot was a chemist". Electivism could never have had its claims allowed, had not a destructive, godless philosophy ushered it suavely in. And so we come by an easy process of reasoning to "place the blame" for our present extravagances on the prevalent lack of discipline of the mind. We are weak in that invaluable quality that Newman adorns with "discriminating convictions, grasp of consequences, avoidance of the random and the flippant, perception of things as they are".[5]

It is to the discipline of the mind of our children that we must turn our shattered resources, if we would serve justice and common sense in executing the sacred trust of education. Our elementary courses must be planned and confined by a philosophy that is rational, that sees the truth of the child's nature and destiny, and sees it whole. The psychology of the growing girl or boy must respect the presence of spiritual tendencies that do not differ in kind from those of the grown-up: it cannot rest satisfied with a laboratory tabulation of sense-agility. It is the homely but God-given province of the primary school to play in turn *alma nutrix* and drill-

[4] Paulsen's *Introduction to Philosophy*, Preface, p. vi.
[5] *Idea of a University*, Preface, p. xii.

master to agile memories, budding imaginations, and just the beginnings of clear perception and self-control. And when finally the elementary product is turned over to the finishing school, our secondary system, of which we Americans are so proud, the *full efficiency* of dormant powers and tendencies should be aimed at with a comprehensive body of truth for contemplation, and a carefully selected method for its application and study. It will be unnecessary to advocate for this period of maximum development of intellectual and moral capacities a thorough grounding in the humanities. Experience is contributing the strongest of arguments against the disproportionate intrusion of special science into the high school curriculum. What primarily concerns us here is the crown of the course, the discipline for which classics and general science pave the way, and by which they are in turn assigned to definite functions in the acquiring of "all that doth become a man". Education without a philosophy is a misnomer.

II.

We submit that the necessity of a unifying, coördinating course of philosophy as a last stage of the student's preparation for life is becoming increasingly patent to discerning educators of our day. The reaction against the elective system and early specialization, and the tendency toward "grouping" instead of "groping" would imply as much. But we are not so confident that our claim will be so willingly allowed when we announce the inevitable deduction to which present necessity urges us: we are convinced that there is one, and only one, all-sufficient instrument for compassing a perfect discipline of the mind. That instrument is the Philosophy of the Schools, the much-maligned, much-ridiculed Scholastic system.

Why be apprehensive of a cold reception for this proposition? Because of the well-known proverb that prejudice is not susceptible of argument. Scholasticism has shared the stigmata of all things medieval and favored of the Catholic Church. Its constituent truths attested by common sense; its method, as old, fundamentally, as Aristotle; its part in vesting the nakedness of paganism with the Christian ideas that

support modern states and society—all are neglected in face of the damaging fact that the Church has smiled upon it, that the Jesuit has made it part and parcel of his battle-armor, and that its principles are conceived as leading infallibly to the threshold of true, rational faith. As lately as Christmas, 1922, President-Emeritus Hadley of Yale, writing for *Harper's* on "What is Education?" presented a perfect appreciation of the Scholastic idea, but seemed to strain and twist his vocabulary lest he be betrayed into using Scholastic terminology. With just a suspicion of prejudice, too, Meiklejohn of Amherst in the article above referred to says that the sciences "will not knuckle under to schemes of thought devised before their principles were known", that "they stand upon the ruins of an older scheme"; and yet in his peroration we read the sincere exhortation: "We must not hesitate dallying with 'subjects', when the unity of knowing is before us as our goal." Who better has condemned and praised Scholasticism in successive breaths?

A reasoned opposition from such eminent educators as the two just mentioned might put us on the defensive. We cannot legislate for preformed judgments.

III.

All good builders begin with a definition. What is mental discipline? This point amicably established, we may proceed to show whether and in what degree Scholastic philosophy fulfills the postulate, and how well, therefore, it is calculated to produce the mental efficiency which is admittedly one of the chief desiderata of our age. Etymologically, mental discipline is evidently synonymous with training of the mind. But what is the mind, and what is training as applied to it? We are in the proper field of psychology, and must answer, not only with Saint Thomas, but with all sane philosophers and empiricists, that the mind of man is made up of two dominating principles, called his intellect and will;[6] that their functionings are mutually interdependent, and that the direction of practically the entire being is under their control. It matters not whether we give these two principles the logical and traditional name

[6] *Summa Theologica*, I, qu. 79; Ia, IIae, qq. 8, 9.

of *faculties* of the rational soul, partaking of its spirituality and simplicity (a designation highly unpalatable at present-day educational symposia), or whether we call them simply primary *instruments* for the proper perfection of the whole man, and of a nature essentially superior to his imagination- and sense-instruments, which he possesses in common with the brute. We must at all events assume as our groundwork the truth of the age-old principle, that the mind was made for the true and the good; and further observation will convince us that the appetites of the will follow, and are proportionate to the perceptions of the intellect. "Ignoti nulla cupido." Which means that one of these twin instruments presents a known good or evil to the other, whereupon we may expect an assent or a rejection on the part of this latter, and a consequent impelling of the whole man to perform or omit the action apprehended as good or bad. The will is blind, and cannot function at all without light borrowed from the intellect; but it can and does exert a corresponding influence over the cognitive instrument by urging it to, or withdrawing it from the contemplation of its object, truth. And finally, it retains as its palmary governing quality a freedom of choice with regard to all objects which the intellect, after due deliberation, does not represent to it as absolutely, here and now, desirable goods.

Thus ponderously and technically does psychology analyze what common sense tells us of the workings of the mind; whence we are led to determine that the mind's perfection will depend upon the harmonious development of the two faculties or instruments which constitute its working apparatus. Education, ever since Homer, has aimed at a harmony between discordant elements within, a balance, an equilibrium of all the powers that go to make a man, a proportionate development of the various instruments he will use through life. Rousseau puts it vividly and accurately when he says: "It matters little to me whether my pupil is intended for the army, the Church or the law. Before his parents chose a calling for him nature called him to be a man. Life is the trade I would teach him."

There is an hierarchy within, as there is one in nature exterior to man, of which he forms a part. When, therefore, we speak of *mental* education, we mean nothing less than the harmonious and appreciative training of the superior instruments

of intellect and will as an all-important element in the general scheme of perfecting the man. Viewing its end negatively, we exclude dullness of parts, narrowness of outlook, the one-sidedness of youthful specialization and premature vocational courses. It cannot confuse shadow with substance, nor hold one doctrine in theory while it uses its opposite in practice. It is opposed at once to the extremes of optimism and pessimism, and to the triumph of expediency over principle. It avoids what Symonds has tellingly called "the warped, the falsified, the egotistical; the petty, the adulterated, the partial; the school, the clique, the coterie." [7] Neither does it connote abundance of matter, but abundance of power to use matter; not bulk, but acumen. In short, your disciplined mind will not make for both ends of the pendulum-swing with break-neck velocity, but will linger at the center of quiet and balance, where the true and the good may be seen as they are.

IV.

But to get out of the range of metaphor and contrast, all discipline implies exercise. The gymnast and the horseman will agree that a perfect working of parts is the result only of well-distributed, regulated, constant activity. And further, it is a well-established axiom that among creatures all action perfects its term by giving it a new form or reality. So when we speak of vital or immanent perfection, where the term, be it corporal or mental, is within the subject acting, we can mean only the acquiring of new and more perfect qualities by the personal activity of the parts under training. "Perfectio viventium usu comparatur." Mental exercise will therefore involve a subject matter and a method; and we are justified in claiming superiority as a disciplinary agent for that exercise or study whose content is most comprehensive in its scope, and whose method is most native to the operations of the mind.

For if the mind of the student is to be tempered like a steel blade to the discernment of the true and the good in their most delicate shades, where

> A hair, perhaps, divides the false and true,

[7] Quoted by Canon Sheehan, *Early Essays and Lectures*, p. 207.

it must be exercised upon the *whole* of the truth,[8] and upon each of the generic relations of its parts. The sum total of the knowable, at least in outline and principle, must be a basic element in the furnishing of an efficient scientific mind. Aristotle has well said that breadth of knowledge has a better claim to be considered scientific knowledge than knowledge of detail, for "one who has knowledge of a whole must have knowledge of each and all of its parts".[9] All truth forms a unit, and the mind is ever in pain to reproduce it in its entirety. That is why we must concede to a study that practices upon the whole skeleton, so to speak, of truth, the praise of excellency as a discipline.

V.

The same consideration will further serve to define the limitations of certain subjects whose benefits as mind disciplines are not seldom exaggerated. All science of course engenders a habit of thought. But the so-called "particular" sciences confine their habits to a corner of the mind, they do not occupy it wholly, nor communicate with other tenants of the same abode of truth. Physics, for instance, will teach methods of exact observation and measurement; mathematics accuracy in the treatment of quantity; history high personal and national ideals; the humanities will care for the government of the imagination, the beginnings of logic, and felicity of speech. We must readily grant to all these studies an important rôle in education. In their own corner of the mind they fulfill their purpose completely. The memory from earliest years must be gradually strengthened and filled, though not overburdened, with facts; the intellect, too, must come in for its gradual development by a collation of such facts and the application of such principles as mathematics affords. It is indispensable that the acquisitive and informative powers be nurtured before those which we may call the disquisitive and formative, by a knowledge from youth of the languages, the sciences and the arts.[10] But the point we are now emphasizing is the inadequacy of such studies as trainers of the *whole*

[8] *Summa Log.*, Tract. 9, cap. 13.

[9] *Metaphys.*, I, Chapter 2.

[10] *Summa Theolog.*, IIa, IIae, qu. 49, 1 ad 2.

mind. Mathematics deals with only one of the properties of corporal being, namely quantity; while the scope of all the physical sciences is confined within an order where all is determined by laws of blind or mechanical necessity. The danger is that the student who specializes, before philosophy, in such partial sciences, may become so habituated to physical law as to forget that there is such a thing as moral liberty. Laplace claimed that gravitation explains all astronomy. If the mechanism of nature accounts for so much, why cannot it explain all? Such is the logic that makes materialism the capital sin of science as we know it.

Again let us summon President Meiklejohn to speak for us: "Just as each [natural] science within its field brings facts to unity and attempts to understand them, just so these separate sciences are facts which we must unify if we would understand them all. . . . I think that every liberal college should demand of all its students that they attempt to relate their various studies into some *ordered scheme of thought.*" [11] President H. W. Chase of the University of North Carolina uses almost the same words: "The liberal arts college . . . must insist that departmental barriers must not interfere with that unification of knowledge which is one of the great needs of modern thought. The amazing *lack of system and unity* which any student of moderate ingenuity can introduce into his college course remains one of the wonders of the modern world." [12]

That this unification of knowledge is actually accomplished by the Scholastic system, and by it alone, we shall presently offer proof, when we shall have said a word upon the necessity of a method *native to the mind*, and therefore universally applicable. The gymnasium may be ever so well equipped, and the instruments ever so well adapted to the formation of a perfect physical machine; but of what avail the apparatus, if the gymnast use it not in measure, systematically, and in a manner adapted to his strength of nerve and muscle? Lifting too heavy a weight will strain, not limber; a year at the punching-bag alone may overdevelop one set of muscles, and leave another flabby; and uninterrupted work on the bars will

[11] Loc. cit., p. 3. Italics ours.
[12] Loc. cit., p. 4. Italics ours.

tire where it is meant to relax. This is true of all exercise. Method is as essential a requisite to success as matter, and *correct* method is infallibly deduced from the observed normal operation of the member to be disciplined. Physical and all other culture prescribes rules to aid nature, not to refashion it.

So it is, too, with due allowance for a halting analogy, with regard to the exercise of the muscles and sinews of the mind. Intellect and will have a natural bent, a favorite series of spiritual activities which they will invariably follow if left to themselves. This normal behavior of the mind, which we might have looked for *a priori*, may be clearly observed in the dawning of reason and deliberation in the child. When we claim and prove, then, for Scholasticism the merit of a complete mental discipline from the standpoint of method, as against the defects of other studies or combinations of studies, we mean simply that Scholastic philosophy has found this natural, universal bent of the mental faculties and caters to it, whereas other studies which make pretensions to complete disciplinary efficiency have failed both to discover and to appeal, except to specific, variable tendencies. President Meiklejohn's thoughts, in the article already referred to, so nearly reproduce our own that we ask once more his witness: "Against the *survey* course which lists, describes and classifies a *group* of studies, I would suggest the *analytic* course, which finds a method of thought and gives a student practice in it. To get a student ready for a group of studies one should select a problem which demands the proper kind of thinking, a certain way of gathering information, a way of asking questions, a way of answering them, and then should set the student's mind at work in just those ways. . . . An introductory course should lead a student not so much by content as by method, not so much by answer as by problem, not only by external list . . . but by the dialectic of a mode of thought."

To gather up briefly some hanging threads, we have concluded from the prevalence of the fad, especially in education, to a deficiency in the mental discipline of our pupils and their teachers. We have "placed the blame" upon the dictators of modern philosophy, whose ignorance of child-nature precludes their training it properly. Finally we have sought the remedy in a study whose content is all-comprehensive sub-

stantially, and whose method is adapted to the natural mental leanings.

VI.

Can Scholastic philosophy, existing as it does close at hand in our twentieth century, provide, and alone provide this sincerely sought remedy? The exigencies of our answer will first require a brief description of what Scholastic philosophy is. As has been said, we do not intend to hark back to its romantic beginnings in the Middle Ages, a period hardly ever examined save under the speckled glass of prejudice. Of course, any distinct creation is best studied at its source, in the genius of its producers, the occasion of its appearance, the circumstances that assured its permanence, etc. But in order that clouded, mistrusted medievalism may not enter our discussion, let us point for illustration to the Scholastic philosophy of the present, as we find it incorporated in all Catholic higher education, and even in some ultra-liberal secular college curricula, where electivism, true to chart, makes it a sorry side-issue. But in thus confining our glance to the present we are studying, be it remembered, a Scholasticism changed in no essential element from the splendid synthesis created by Saint Thomas and his fellow-pioneers. Modified or adjusted accidentally it has been—and this is eloquent tribute to its pliability—to follow the march of the physical sciences, and the *pari passu* growth of groundless systems of philosophy, to sift the true from the false in the former, and to hurl its syllogistic anathemas fearlessly at the latter.

One practical advantage must result from basing a "reform" argument upon Scholastic philosophy in its modern dress: it will show that the panacea for our present pedagogical ills is close at hand, that text books embodying a well-tested and safe system of education are practically immediately available and in ample abundance, for those who are intellectually honest enough to concede its worth; that "back to Saint Thomas" is not such a far cry after all, since his genius has lived an unbroken life to this day, safe like so many other worth-while institutions in the Church's protecting arms.

Succinctly we may call Scholastic philosophy a system of thought based on the ancient synthesis of Aristotle, amplified

by a whole series of Christian ideas, and adapted in its method to serve the purposes of scientific research and orderly disputation, on the subject of all that is knowable. Of its content we quote from Father Liberatore, one of Scholasticism's foremost representatives in modern times: "Philosophy is to be divided according to the diversity and variety of the objects proposed to its contemplation. These objects are found either in the movements of the mind or in the world of reality exterior to it, to which these movements are related. Again, the movements of the mind are subdivided into those of cognition and those of appetite. Truth is the quest of the former; the possession of good that of the latter. Things, moreover, which terminate these mental activities, either exhibit the nature of *being* (under which aspect they are the objects of the intellect's contemplation), or convey the idea of the *good* and *just* (whereby they constitute matter for licit and praiseworthy desire on the part of the will). There arise therefore from this consideration four separate subjects of study: those of Logic, of Metaphysics, of Moral Philosophy, and of Natural Law." [13] This division is usually modified to include the following courses: Minor and Major Logic, or the science of right thinking and of the grounds of certitude; Ontology, or the investigation of the nature of being and its properties in general; Psychology, or the study of the soul in the plant, the animal, and principally in man; Cosmology, which treats the world as a physical, changeable reality; Ethics, which directs the free acts of man by its principles to the attainment of his end in life; and finally, Natural Theology, which determines the existence and attributes of God, together with what reason can outline of His activities. The partition of these single subjects may be found in the prospectus of almost any Catholic college.

VII.

The subject-matter of Scholastic philosophy is therefore an ordered, organic whole, covering the entire range of logical and ontological truth ("scientia *rerum* per ultimas causas"), the truth within the philosophizing subject and the truth external to him. It scrutinizes the workings of his mind and

[13] *Institutiones Philosophicae*, p. 14.

body, penetrates to the nature of men and things about him in the world, soars upon the wings of reason into the realm of spirits, even to the august person of God; and when it can delve no deeper into the sublime mysteries of the Creator's plan and its fulfillment, it bows its noble spirit humbly, though never more rationally, before the throne of revelation. Speculative and practical truth in turn engage its attention. Theory and application go hand in hand, lest action be misguided and irrational, or thought lie fallow in a barren mind. This is the body of material upon which the Scholastic philosopher does his mental hewing and carving, sharpening the whole mind to keenness and even temper. The *whole* mind, we say, and insist on the modifier; for no single field of thought or action with which reason or will can occupy themselves has been left outside its scope. Never in after life can the product of Scholastic training say candidly: "Here is a department of life that is wholly new to me, a subject I have never prepared myself to handle, a truth that was not included in my philosophical view of the world." True, there will be ever new applications to be made, a mass of erudition to be gained in applied science, and a general filling-in of the world-picture in personal experience. But there will be no new principle added, no addition to the picture's *outline*, nor subtraction from it. Life and the world of living beings is for such a student's mind a well-knitted whole, whose parts are closely related one to another and all to him; with this comprehensive vision of realities, his intellect stands ready to meet specific emergencies of a complicated active life, where truth must be separated from falsehood; and his will is girded to the task of directing the whole man to the good represented to it. This is complete mental discipline; this is the fruit of the organic unity and comprehensiveness of the subject matter of Scholastic philosophy.

On the other hand, need we delay on the insufficiency of other so-called systems to supply this adequate object for the exercise of the mental faculties? To a philosophy which begins with a denial of its own effectiveness, to one which leaves out God or makes Him identical with ourselves, to one which concerns itself solely with a liberal survey of the *history* of philosophical systems, scant consideration can be given. The

first is sceptical or destructive, the second incomplete or perverse, the third purely informational, and in no sense disciplinary, except perhaps of the memory.

For the second and concluding element in the remedy, we are to look to Scholasticism for a method which respects the nature of the mind, and is therefore native to all minds. Cardinal Mercier in his *Manual* enumerates some of the salient features of Scholastic method as "fidelity to revealed truths, respect for tradition, the harmonious combination of analysis with synthesis, or of induction with deduction, and the avoidance of the two great extremes of idealism and positivism. Not flowers or poems, but simplicity and straightforwardness are its earmarks." [14] We may add that the syllogism is its arbiter, with abstraction, not pure *formalism*, and accurate distinction of even the microscopic grains of truth from the untrue, as its characteristic mode of attack. The interrelation of all truth, as we have seen, is its groundwork. That there is nothing artificial or strained about any aspect of this method we may safely take for granted, after we have noted that the *syllogism* [15] gives our law-courts and our civic, social and religious life their intellectual and moral sanction; that the dictionary of the language of every civilized nation is a network of *abstractions*; and that the fabric of our legal profession depends upon the subtle, elusive *distinction* that divides right from wrong.

In a letter to his friend Wagner, the German philosopher Leibnitz has this to say in praise of the syllogism: "I am persuaded that if we acted oftener so, if we sent one another syllogisms and polysyllogisms with the replies in form, we could very often, in the most important scientific questions, get at the bottom of things, and dispel a great many imaginations and dreams. By the very nature of the proceedings we should cut short repetitions, exaggerations, digressions, incomplete expositions, voluntary or involuntary omissions, mistakes of order, misunderstandings and all the annoying results that follow from these things." [16] More than two centuries ago

[14] *Manual of Scholastic Philosophy*, pp. 30 ff.

[15] *De Veritate*, qu. 24 a. 1 ad 13um; *Summa Log.*, Tract. 8, cap. 1.

[16] Quoted by De Wulf, *Scholasticism Old and New*, p. 27.

these words were written. How relevant they would be to-day, coming from the pen of a modern philosopher!

VIII.

Popular objections against the philosophy of the Scholastics, a thousand times repeated and as often refuted, are those which accuse it of puerility, of bootless hair-splitting, and of mixing itself up with theology. The first of these charges is effectually dismissed by introducing the objector to a Scholastic text book, on Ethics, say, or Ontology. Disputes indeed he will find, and acrid ones, for the truth has its secret hiding-places; but of hardly one will he be able to say that it is childish. Even so unsympathetic a writer as Professor Monroe of Columbia objects to the pressing of this extreme charge, as a failure to apprehend the Scholastic point of view: "Such questions as 'Can God make two hills without the intervening valley?' or 'How many angels can stand on the point of a needle?' conceal beneath their simple form the profound inquiries concerning the relation of finite to infinite, the attributes of the infinite, the nature of reality. Give them a form that only the trained metaphysician can understand, and they constitute the profundities of modern thought; give them such form as the untrained adult or youth just beginning his course of scholasic studies can comprehend and handle, and they form the *monstrosities* of the Schoolmen." [17] In other words, Scholasticism is reprobate because of its common-sense, concrete treatment of the very questions modern philosophers and educators involve in a hopeless maze of technical terms and figured phrases!

A liberal world has laughed at the Scholastics, too, for what Chesterton picturesquely calls "monstrous wars about small points . . . earthquakes of emotion about a gesture or a word. It was only a matter of an inch," he adds, "—but an inch is everything when you are balancing."

As for the accusation of meddling with theology, it will be proven to be groundless when we distinguish between the matter and the method of the system. It is eminently true that the Catholic Church has adopted in large measure the

[17] *A Brief History of Education*, pp. 136 ff. Italics ours.

Scholastic method for the presentation of her doctrines, and in this she shows her proverbial prudence in the use of the best human instruments to further her divine mission. But it is as eminently false that the body-matter of Scholastic philosophy contains a single grain of revealed truth *as* revealed truth. None of its doctrines *contradicts* revealed truth, for that would stamp it as false. But to say, as, for instance, Professor Paulsen has said, that " the Church applied the axe to the roots of her faith when she made the Aristotelian-Ptolemaic cosmology an article of faith ",[18] is to commit a gross historical error. Scholastic philosophy suffers no such dictatorial magistracy from religion. It is as free from Church interference within its own field as any of the bizarre systems which grace the pages of our secular university catalogues.

Aristotle has been beautifully called by Dante " the master of those who know ". Newman says as beautifully that we are all born Aristotelians, children all of " the oracle of nature and of truth ".[19] Our Lord Jesus Christ came upon earth to perfect and renew the best that nature had left to paganism—that we might have life, and have it more abundantly. Scholastic philosophy is nothing but the enriching of Aristotle's common sense with the Christian perspective. " Whatever of truth there is," writes Saint Thomas after Saint Augustine, " in the works of the pagan philosophers, should be taken from them, as from unjust possessors." [20]

It is a perverse education that has made an Aristotelian world half-Kantian, and the compelling logic of William James's well-reasoned position is daily being more surely forced upon us: " I must either bring back Scholasticism *and common sense*, or else I must squarely confess the solution of the [soul] problem impossible." [21] Nothing short of weakness of will could make James and those myriads of our children's teachers whom he has influenced reject the first alternative, and then evade the second by a labored and impossible compromise.

[18] *Introduction to Philosophy*, tr. by Thill, p. 159.
[19] *Idea of a University*, p. 109.
[20] *Summa Theologica*, I, q. 84, a. 5, corp.
[21] *A Pluralistic Universe*, p. 208.

Until modern philosophers summon up candor and sincerity enough to give this honest dilemma a second and more rational consideration, we may look for an endless succession of penitent confessions anent the tyranny of the fad and the lack of mental discipline in our education.

J. EDWARD COFFEY, S.J.

Woodstock College, Maryland.

ST. THOMAS POET-LAUREATE OF THE EUCHARIST.

Peperit semel sed leonem.—H. A. Daniel.

I. PEPERIT SEMEL.

IT may appear strange that a discussion of the hymnodal work of St. Thomas should, at this late day, be compelled to begin with the somewhat arid task of discrimination between his authentic works and others mistakenly or doubtfully attributed to his authorship.

There is now no question, indeed, of the correctness of the common ascription to him of the Lauda Sion, the Pange Lingua, the Sacris Solemniis, or even of the Adoro Te, albeit this last is not officially liturgical and therefore was not a part of the labor undergone in the composition of the Office for Corpus Christi.

The Verbum Supernum had also been included unquestioningly in the attribution to him of the Roman Breviary hymns of the great Festival, until Dom Morin constructed fair argumentation, in the *Revue Bénédictine* for April, 1910, leading to a different view. The learned Benedictine compared the *Officium* composed by the Saint with that found in old Cistercian breviaries (1484-1674) and thought it probable that the Saint borrowed from the Cistercian Office the hymns there given for Matins and Lauds, combining, amending and shortening them into the hymn now found at Lauds in the Roman Breviary. From the supposedly older Cistercian hymn for Matins, he took stanzas 1, 3, 4 (now in the Roman Breviary appearing as 1, 2, 3), omitting the 2nd stanza:

2. Venit ad aegros medicus,
Dans salutis remedia;
Venit doctor salvificus,
Alta docens mysteria.

From the hymn at Lauds he took stanzas 3, 4, 5 (now in the Roman Breviary appearing as stanzas 4, 5, 6). The omitted stanzas are:

1. In divinis operibus
Nulla res sic mirabilis:
Nam nos cibat iste cibus
Manens indivisibilis.

2. Sumunt omnes et singuli,
Semperque tota sumitur
Veritas hujus pabuli,
Quod sumptum non consumitur.

The Saint altered the 3rd stanza:

Cistercian.	*Roman.*
Jesus nascens se socium,	Se nascens dedit socium,
Convescens in edulium,	Convescens in edulium,
Pendens dedit in pretium,	Se moriens in pretium,
Se regnans dat in praemium.	Se regnans dat in praemium.

The alterations here are few but subtly effective both for greater syntactical symmetry and for easier flowing rhythm.

The question arises: Did the Cistercians elaborate the hymn of the Saint into two hymns, or did the Saint condense the two hymns of the Cistercian Office into one? Dom Morin notes that the Cistercians sang the hymns to the melody of the Advent hymn, *Verbum supernum prodiens*, whose first line was borrowed as well. We, on the contrary, sing our Lauds hymn to the melody of the Ascension-tide hymn, *Aeterne Rex altissime*, and " it is very natural to suppose that the melody of the Advent hymn was the primitive one." Again, the Cistercians accepted the Pange Lingua and the Sacris Solemniis; why should they have balked at the Verbum Supernum? Or, taking it, why should they have enlarged it into two hymns? Such an enlargement is improbable, for the reason that the omitted stanzas are closely connected with their context, presenting the appearance of originality rather than of interpolation. Various other reasons are appositely constructed, but perhaps the most cogent of all is the argument that our hymn for Lauds presents a neater text in its condensation of matter and form, while the revision of the stanza *Jesus nascens se socium* is suggestive, in its rhythmic and syntactical felicities, of amendments made in the wording of a less elegantly constructed original text.

Whilst for such reasons as these the ascription to St. Thomas may be considered doubtful, the assumption that the Saint did not compose, but merely revised, older Cistercian hymns in

order to furnish his Officium with a hymn for Lauds, does not really take anything away from his glory as Poet-Laureate of the Eucharist. To have condensed the two Cistercian hymns into a briefer and neater form, omitting what could easily be spared and altering what could be bettered, would still have been the work of an exquisitely gifted poetical taste, such as the Saint is seen, from his authentic work, to have eminently possessed.

Perhaps an argument *pro* might be constructed from the fact that the Lauds hymn follows the obvious procedure of the Saint in basing the rhythms of his hymns on those of older ones. The Lauda Sion, for instance, is considered by hymnologists as having taken the *Laudes crucis attollamus* of Adam of St. Victor for a model both of rhythm and of stanzaic forms. So, too, the Pange Lingua takes its first line from the Passion hymn of Venantius Fortunatus, as well as the stanzaic form, just as the Lauds hymn takes both the first line and the quatrain-form from the Advent hymn. Similarly, the Sacris Solemniis follows in accentual rhythms the swing of the quantitative measures found in the *Sanctorum meritis inclyta gaudia.*

While the ascription of the Lauds hymn to the Saint may now be considered uncertain, the attribution to him of the *O esca viatorum* and of the *Ut jucundas cervus undas* can be explained only on the principle, rather cynically expressed: *On ne prête qu'aux riches.* The O Esca, translated into English verse some ten times, mostly by Protestant pens, is ascribed to the Saint in F. A. March's carefully edited volume of *Latin Hymns,* and in Donahoe's *Early Christian Hymns.* It cannot, however, be traced back farther than the latter half of the seventeenth century, appearing in two Catholic hymnals published at Mainz in 1661 and 1671 respectively. Doubtless March depended on Koenigsfeld and Palmer, whom he cites for the ascription. He thinks it a " happy echo " of the hymns of the Saint. This is really one of the difficulties standing in the way of the ascription. The echo is one merely of words rather than of construction or of argument. In this last respect, it is true that the Saint does repeat himself in his hymns. As to the hymn or cycle of poems commencing with *Ut jucundas cervus undas,* ascribed to the Saint in a fourteenth-cen-

tury manuscript cited by Mone, it is sufficiently clear that it dates back to earlier times. It dates somewhere between the middle of the eleventh century and the middle of the twelfth. St. Thomas, however, was born in 1225. Its provenance, also, has been limited to either France or England.

The authentic hymns of the Saint, centering in the Feast of Corpus Christi, composed at the request of Pope Urban IV and not by a spontaneous poetical afflatus, constitute what Daniel happily describes as a single offspring—Peperit semel.

II. Sed Leonem.

The eulogy implied in the title of The Eucharistic Poet-Laureate is accurate and modest withal. It is a sufficiently faint echo of the praise accorded to St. Thomas by the eminent hymnologist, Daniel, in his *Thesaurus Hymnologicus.* The Angelic Doctor is " venerabilis Sacramenti laudator summus ", whom " non sine numinis afflatu cecinisse credas." The theme of his singing is spiritual and altogether heavenly, and after he had completed it " tam praeclare ne dicam unice ", he sang thenceforward no more: " Peperit semel sed leonem." Ordinarily economical of words, Daniel seems here to be himself inspired into beautiful diction alike by the celestial theme and by its holy singer.

This view is universally shared by Catholic sentiment, whether critical or popular. Official expression—somewhat indirect, it is true, but nevertheless strikingly appreciative—of the sentiment appears in the decision of the Correctores of the Breviary hymns under the classicist, Pope Urban VIII, not to tamper with the texts of the Corpus Christi hymns. Such a reconstruction of these hymns as would rob them both of their non-classical accentual rhythms and splendid abundance of rhyme could not, it is true, but be fundamental. But the labor could have been undergone successfully by the eminent Jesuits in whose hands the reform had been placed. Witness the many changes in the old *Verbum supernum prodiens* to rob it of rhymes and of its accentual rhythm. But such a reconstruction of the Corpus Christi hymns was farthest from the reverent appreciation, by the Correctores, of the liturgical thesaurus. And the hymns of St. Thomas, together with a few others, emerged unscathed from the critical ordeal, for

they filled a place in the hearts of the faithful as well as in the sacred liturgy that simply could not otherwise be fairly occupied.

This popular sentiment is found not alone in the clergy at large, whose hearts are melted to tenderness by the spiritual unction and the heavenly sweetness of the Eucharistic hymns, but as well in the laity, whose piety is constantly stimulated by the O Salutaris at innumerable expositions of the Blessed Sacrament, by the Pange Lingua in most elaborate liturgical processions such as that of Holy Thursday, by musical settings of the integral Lauda Sion by composers like Mendelssohn and Lambillotte and of favorite excerpts such as the Panis Angelicus from the Sacris Solemniis and the Ecce Panis from the Sequence.

Nor is Protestant appreciation lacking, although manifesting itself at times in indirect ways. Daniel assures us that the Pange Lingua, and even the Lauda Sion, enjoyed festival use and highest encomiums amongst the Lutherans, although Luther himself, with customary vulgarity, inveighed against the Old Testament typical citations in the Sequence. And English Protestant hymnologists, whilst carefully eliminating the intensely doctrinal portions, have been so overcome by the fervor and literary beauty of the hymns that they embodied translated portions in their anthologies of sacred verse. Chancellor Benedict, indeed, gives a full translation of the Lauda Sion, simply safeguarding his Protestant orthodoxy by an apposite declaration.[1]

It might well be considered a work of literary and liturgical supererogation, a carrying of coals to Newcastle, to present

[1] Chancellor Benedict was a judge in New York "equally respected for his attainments as a jurist and his character as a man and a Christian." He says of the author of the Lauda Sion: "It is but just to say that he doubtless intended that his words should be understood according to the faith which the Roman Catholic Church now teaches; but it may also be said that the hymn might have been written by a Protestant, without doing violence to the faith of the Protestant Church, although it does not fully express that faith; and I have preferred to translate it in that sense." The excellent jurist was not a good theologian. Dr. Thompson, the Presbyterian editor of Duffield's *Latin Hymn-Writers*, etc., more correctly says: "The sixth, seventh and eighth verses express the doctrine of transubstantiation so distinctly that one must have gone as far as Dr. Pusey, who avowed that he held 'all Roman doctrine' before using their words in any but a non-natural sense." The interesting point for us is, of course, that Chancellor Benedict should have gone to such trouble to include a translation of the great Sequence in his slim volume, *The Hymn of Hildebert*.

clerical readers with a formal analysis of the hymns, to point out their doctrinal exactness, their epigrammatic condensations of thought and expression, their winning cadences, their limpid flow, their crystallized beauty. We have known and loved the hymns too long to be unfamiliar with all of these excellences. It is nevertheless a kindly human sentiment that urges us to have others admire whatsoever is very near to our own hearts. We may properly wish to know how the most highly cultured amongst our separated brethren regard our Eucharistic hymns. Some intimations of this respect and admiration have been given already. We may now descend to a greater particularity.

In his *Christ in Song*, the Rev. Dr. Schaff says of the Pange Lingua that "although it savors strongly of transubstantiation (ver. 4) it *could not be omitted*[2] in this collection." The Rev. Dr. Neale, generally esteemed as perhaps the most felicitous translator of Latin hymns, translates it in his little volume of *Medieval Hymns and Sequences* and assigns to it the relatively extraordinary space of two closely printed pages for most discerning comment on the beauty of the hymn and on the curiously condensed and theologically accurate antitheses found in the fourth stanza,[3] which is "the great *crux* of the translator." He declares that the hymn "contests the second place among those of the Western Church with the *Vexilla Regis*, the *Stabat Mater*, the *Jesu dulcis Memoria*, the *Ad Regias Agni Dapes*, the *Ad Supernum*, and one or two others, leaving the *Dies Irae* in its unapproachable glory. It has been a bow of Ulysses to translators." Chancellor Benedict translates both the Pange Lingua and the Lauda Sion. Overcome by the beauty of the Sequence, he evidently felt that (in the words of Dr. Schaff) it "could not be omitted" from his slim volume. The Rev. Dr. R. E. Thompson, a Presbyterian editor of Duffield's *Latin Hymn-Writers and Their Hymns*, also admits in the volume

[2] Italics mine.

[3] He gives one translation, and objects to it on the ground that "Here the *incarnation* of the Word, so necessary to the antithesis, is omitted: and so exact a writer as S. Thomas would never have used the expression *by* ONE *word*." He objects to another rendering, because "Here the antithesis is utterly lost, by the substitution of *Incarnate* for *made flesh*, and *bidding* for *word*, to say nothing of *Blood-shedding* for *Blood*." These instances may serve to illustrate the care with which he approached the translation of this masterpiece: but his complete analysis will repay a full reading. — *Mediæval Hymns and Sequences*, 3rd ed., pp. 179-181.

a translation of six stanzas of the Sequence. Finally, Dr. Neale says of the Adoro Te: "It is worthy of notice how the Angelic Doctor, as if afraid to employ any pomp of words on approaching so tremendous a Mystery, has used the very simplest expressions throughout."

We may close our study with a brief glance at the rhythmic and rhymic peculiarities of the Eucharistic hymns.

The Verbum Supernum keeps the accentual rhythm of its prototype of Advent and merely makes the rhymes alternating. The Pange Lingua compensates with abundant rhyme the lack of quantitative verse, splitting each of the long lines of its prototype by Venantius Fortunatus into two, and giving the stanza alternate rhymes. The Sanctorum Meritis suggested to the Saint a most curiously involved scheme of rhymes, which may be illustrated in the stanza Panis Angelicus of the Sacris Solemniis:

Panis angelicus	Lo! the Angelic Bread
Fit panis hominum;	Feedeth the sons of men;
Dat panis coelicus	Figures and types are fled
Figuris terminum:	Never to come again:
O res mirabilis!	O what a wondrous thing!
Manducat Dominum	Lowly and poor are fed,
Pauper, servus et humilis.	Banqueting on their Lord and King.

An analysis of the rhythmic felicity of the Adoro Te has been given elsewhere,[4] and limitations of space will hardly permit of sufficiently full quotation here.

There remains for comment only the sublime Sequence. Hymnologists declare that its rhythmic and stanzaic structure is based on the Sequence, *Laudes crucis attollamus*. Despite the similarity of the opening words, *Laudes* and *Lauda*, I venture to think that St. Thomas based his Sequence rather on the *Zyma vetus expurgetur* of Adam of St. Victor, which offers equal correspondence in both its typical and its variant stanzas, has a striking similarity in theme, and in its closing stanza gives us the very thought of the Angelic Doctor.[5]

H. T. HENRY.

The Catholic University, Washington, D. C.

[4] Henry, *Eucharistica*, p. 222.

[5] Mone, *Lateinische Hymnen des Mittelalters*, I, pp. 278-279, gives the text of *Recollamus sacram coenam* (probably of the fourteenth century) and describes it as a side-piece to our Sequence. Echoing throughout the theology and even the phraseology of St. Thomas, and elegantly constructed in respect both of rhyme and of rhythm, it nevertheless acts as a foil to the grander conception of the Angelic Doctor.

"SACRIFICE" ACCORDING TO THE ANGELIC DOCTOR.

I.

RECENT articles on the sacrifice of the Mass [1] call special attention to the theory of Père de La Taille, S.J., and discuss the same.

The Council of Trent (Schema reformata 1552) states: "Cum constet rem externam mystica Sacerdotis operatione consecratam ac Deo oblatam sacrificium esse proprie dictum." Here then for proper sacrifice it is required "that an external thing be both consecrated and offered to God by the mystical operation of a priest". It follows that anything merely internal is not sufficient: neither is a mere offering or oblation to God. Note the "mystical operation of the priest" who by one and the same act and at the same time both offers and consecrates the external thing. One naturally asks what is a mystical operation. Speaking of the mystical sense of S. Scripture the *Catholic Dictionary* says: "Sometimes God ordained that things signified by the words should signify other things, and so we get the mystical or spiritual sense". Thus it may be said when the "operation by a priest" signifies some other operation, then it too becomes mystical. It is indeed one operation with two effects, the offering to God of an external thing with the consecration (or making "something sacred") of the same. It must signify some similar operation to be mystical. St. Thomas, writing of the causes of the Sacrificial Ceremonies of the Old Law, explains that, besides the literal meaning that ordained them "ad cultum Dei", they had another "figuralem sive mysticam, secundum quod ordinabantur ad figurandum Christum".[2] The "mystical operation of the priest" "represents" then a similar operation of Christ. This representation requires two things: that it be a likeness and that it participate in the effects.[3] Hence we conclude, the operation of the priest, in so far as mystical, is a likeness and participation in the effects of Christ's operation on the cross, and both offers and consecrates the external thing. Thus it enters

[1] *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, by Dr. Pierse (May, 1922) and by Fr. D'Arcy, S. J. (Jan., 1923).

[2] Ia, IIae, Q. 102, art. 3, C.

[3] Vide III, Q. 83, art. 1, C.

into the very essence of sacrifice. Finally, as the act of worship here considered is divine worship or the highest, it follows that the external thing offered and consecrated becomes through the "mystica sacerdotis operatione" itself an act of supreme worship. Therefore, as a thing deputed to divine service is thereby rendered sacred, so for a greater reason the external thing that is externally the divine worship itself, must of necessity become "aliquid sacrum".

The doctrine of St. Thomas is essentially the same as that set forth by the Council of Trent.

Sacrifice, the Angelic Doctor explains, is so called because something is made sacred (*sacrum facere*): "Sacrificium dicitur ex hoc quod homo facit aliquid sacrum",[4] and anything is made sacred in so far as it is dedicated to divine worship, "sacra utpote ad cultum Dei dicata".[5] To have a sacrifice properly so-called something must be done that effects the things offered to God. "Sacrificia proprie dicuntur quando circa res Deo oblatas aliquid fit." Mere oblation is not sufficient for sacrifice. It is equally clear that mere consecration without oblation is not sufficient. Even when both oblation and consecration are present, any kind of consecration will not do. A special kind is required. This brings us to the well known passage of the *Summa* the true interpretation of which helps us to the correct and accurate meaning of our Saint's theory of Sacrifice: "Nomen oblationis commune est ad omnes res quae in cultum Dei exhibentur: ita quod si aliquid exhibeatur in cultum divinum quasi in aliquod sacrum, quod inde fieri debeat consumendum et oblatio est et sacrificium; unde Ex. 29 dicitur 'offeres totum arietem in incensum super altare: oblatio est Domino, odor suavissimus victimae Dei', et Levit. 2 dicitur; 'Anima cum obtulerit oblationem sacrificii Deo simila erit ejus oblatio': si vero sic exhibentur ut integrum maneat divino cultui deputandum vel in usus ministrorum expendendum, erit oblatio et non sacrificium."[6]

Different interpretations are given to this passage. It is well to bear in mind that this response is an explanation ere

[4] II–III, Q. 85, art. 3.
[5] Ia, IIae, Q. 101, art. 4, C. 3.
[6] Ia, IIae, Q. 86, art. 1, Resp.

answering the question "are men necessarily bound by precept to oblations." "Deputare" from the context means something to be paid to the Church for oblations, either because it was so appointed by will or by promise. Lamiroy[7] and others interpret "consumere" as meaning destruction. Thus "by destruction the thing offered becomes a sacrifice—hence some kind of destruction is of the essence of sacrifice." This view assumes but does not prove that *consumere* means here to destroy.

But the term has other meanings, such as to "expend wholly," to "employ," e. g. "studium in alicujus honorem consumere" or "pecuniam in agrorum coemptionibus consumere".

The contrast here with "oblation" rests, it seems, in this that in oblations the thing was set apart for divine worship. In sacrifice the thing offered actually itself becomes divine worship, and that necessarily and integrally. Thus in an oblation, the thing offered might be wholly used for the support of the priest, or for anything connected with divine worship; only when expended wholly as divine worship itself, did an oblation become a sacrifice. Both oblations and sacrifices are "sacra". Clearly then the consecration that makes an offering merely an oblation is not nearly so specific and perfect as that which makes it a sacrifice. Destruction, according to St. Thomas, has a twofold function: to indicate the destruction of sin which separates from God, and to show that, because of sin, man deserves death.[8] By a dispensation of Divine providence this destruction in holocausts was wrought either by human nature (that is to say, by man who committed sin), or by wood ignited, since wood furnished the instrument of sin. Thus the action of the very thing that did sin is now utilized to its undoing. However, the human nature that committed sin was not the human nature of Christ; for he had no human father. Thus the Chief Priest of the sacrifice did not himself destroy the victim. He who required expiation killed the victim, and the sons of Aaron or junior priests both offered the blood and put in order the parts of the victim placed on the

[7] De essentia s. s. missae sacrificii.

[8] Ia, IIae, Q. 102, art. 111, 5.

fire they had lighted on the altar.[9] The Chief Priest accepts all that the others do, and through this offers his sacrifices. "The priest shall offer it all and burn it all upon the altar for a holocaust."[10] Even the birds that were offered were not killed by the Chief Priest; he broke the place of the wound, making "the blood run down" (v. 15). He accepts the fire others have lighted, and puts it under the wood (v. 17). The fact that the fire may be put under the wood either by him or by other priests shows that this act is not essential to the sacrifice, for undoubtedly the Chief Priest always placed the whole action required, and always offered the sacrifice. Thus the essential was that the Chief Priest should accept such acts and utilize them unto externally manifesting supreme reverence to God, and the total subjection and offering to God of all that man is, or possesses. Hence destruction is utilized to disclose the greatness of the sacrifice offered—sublime love, veneration, subjection, and honor—but is not itself a part of the offering. "Ideo totum comburebatur, ut sicut totum animal resolutum in vaporem sursum ascendebat ita etiam significaretur totum hominem et omnia quae ipsius sunt Dei dominio subjecta et ei offerenda".[11] We may conclude then that destruction is at times an instrument accepted and utilized even as fire, but is not itself a part of the offering nor essential to sacrifice. Hence "consumendum" must be taken to denote that the thing offered has to be wholly utilized through the act of the priest offering. Thus it becomes the external act of divine worship and necessarily therefore a sacred thing. The "Scape-Goat," through the priestly mystical sacrificial operation, became the act of outward divine worship. It was wholly utilized therefore when offered to God; though the goat was not actually killed or destroyed. Hence the meaning of sacrifice must be anything that is so offered as being wholly expended ("consumendum") into divine worship as into a sacred something which it must thence necessarily become. The interpretation of Suarez,[12] "ad rationem sacrificii ut sic sufficit oblatio quacumque ratione in ea aliquid sacrum fiat circa rem oblatam,"

[9] Levit. 1:4, 9.
[10] Ibid., v. 13.
[11] Ia, IIae, ibid., ad 8.
[12] In 3 am part. A 74, S. 2, N. 14.

does not seem satisfactory. A church when consecrated is offered to God and made a sacred thing, yet this cannot be called a sacrifice.

It is inconceivable that any soul stained by sin, and therefore because of sin abhorred of God, could wish to please Him and give Him highest honor by offering itself. Only Christ our Saviour therefore could really offer such a sacrifice, and only by some mystic union with Him could any priest hope to do the same. Hence in every true sacrifice, the priestly action of offering must be a figure of Christ's offering and participation in the same. To express outwardly the proper reverence to God all sacrifices must participate in the sacrifice of the Cross, that their imperfections may be removed. There must be a likeness, that bespeaks the one true sacrifice; there must be a participation in its effects, that made the oblation an instrument—"Instrumenta autem colendi pertinent ad sacra",[13] an "aliquid sacrum" exhibiting outwardly and truly the worship that properly belongs to God. Now since St. Thomas maintains that sacrifice effected all this, the proper ordination of the mind, the proper interior offering of the interior spiritual sacrifice, and the proper worship due to God alone, it follows that the "operation of the priest must be mystic".

Thus the Council of Trent drew out in a few words and explicitly expressed the pith and essentials of St. Thomas on sacrifice. His definition therefore is identical with that of the Council of Trent. Sacrifice may then be defined as something external, that by the very way of offering—i. e. by the mystical operation of the priest—becomes both an oblation and at the same time necessarily also "something sacred, exhibiting the highest worship to God." We ask: How is the proper manner of offering or the proper ceremony of sacrifice to be determined? St. Thomas answers: "determinatio sacrificiorum est ex institutione humana vel divina".[14] The reason of this is simple. The act of offering is a public act that concerns many. Their agreement as to its manner and adequacy is therefore required.

From the very nature of the case it is also necessary that this offering be acceptable to God. Where God gave no posi-

[13] Ia, IIae, Q. 101, art. 4.

[14] IIa, IIae, Q. 85, art. 2 c.

tive indication of the fact men could only deduce that this would be so when to the best of their knowledge they made their sacrifice truly becoming, truly reasonable and adequate. Where divine law laid down the manner of the sacrifice and prohibited all others, it was clear such offering fulfilled all necessary conditions and must be observed.

It is well, however, to remember that God who sees the heart and the fulness of the internal sacrifice, does not need any external sacrifices. Man indeed requires them to express his outward devotion and reverence, and because it is natural to him to express by some outward sign the inwardly engrossing ideas of his soul and this not only for his own but for his neighbor's welfare.

Thus because God loves us He wishes external sacrifice. " Deum non colimus per exteriora sacrificia aut munera propter ipsum sed propter nos et propter proximos, non enim indiget sacrificiis nostris; sed vult sibi ea offerri." [15]

This emphasizes the prime importance of the internal sacrifice and where this is absent of how little avail is the external sacrifice. How wonderfully did the Cross express the Saviour's ineffable devotion. How wonderfully too did it secure " proximorum utilitatem ".

The definition of St. Thomas holds good for every sacrifice. Surely the pagan made his sacrificial victim both an offering and something sacred that expressed his highest worship to his deity. Since the deity was not the true God, since his internal disposition rarely or never was adequate for internal sacrifice, since his manner of offering was often unreasonable and unbecoming and could never be a representation of the Cross, it is easy to see that such sacrifices were in reality abominable and execrable malfeasances. It were easy to apply the definition to the sacrifices of the Old Law, but time and space will not permit it. Let us however apply it to the patriot who dies for his country. This is not sacrifice strictly, but it brings out the force and genuineness of the definition. The patriot offers his life for his country. She shows him the conditions wherein he must offer it, and that they may effect his death. The patriot does not kill himself; yet when these accepted

[15] IIa, IIae, Q. 30, art. 4, 1.

conditions break up his life, trumpet-tongued he expresses through them the highest act of devotion, the depth of his love and the absolute genuineness of his loyalty and reverence. His great love through these conditions makes the offering of His life an oblation and a national sacred thing expressing the highest patriotism. Even so, but much more, Christ's death on the Cross.

His Father had laid down the conditions and the manner of the Saviour's death. Through these must His life and Blood be offered to express the highest reverence and devotion, to repair the insubordination of man, and man's lack of love, of genuine devotion and service. The Saviour freely accepts them and through them offers His sacrifice expressing ineffable reverence, love, and devotion. His divine love through them makes His offering both an oblation and a sacred thing, exhibiting the highest worship to God. Thus Christ offered a real sacrifice. The rewards and effects of that sacrifice for Himself and for all men, however great, are not a part of the present question. It may indeed be asked, how could Christ who is already, by the hypostatic union, the most Sacred, be further rendered a sacred thing. The answer is that the hypostatic union did not formally constitute a sacrificial operation, making His sacred blood and life an oblation that was an external thing which shows the highest act of worship to God. "Dicendum (est) quod sanctitas humanitatis Christi a principio non impedit quin ipsamet humana natura cum in passione oblata est, Deo sanctificata novo modo fuerit ut hostia actualiter tunc exhibita; acquisivit enim actualem hostiae sanctificationem tunc ex antiqua charitate et gratia unionis sanctificante eamdem absolute." [16] Thus the humanity of Christ, the oblation or host, not only receives its sanctification from the hypostatic union that makes it absolutely holy but also from that "antiqua charitas" which actually uses it as a host.

II.

An attempt having been made correctly to convey the teaching of the Angelic Doctor on "Sacrifice in General", it remains to examine his teaching on the "Sacrifice of the Mass",

[16] III, Q. 23, art. 11, 3.

and to see how he solves the difficult question as to how the Mass is a true sacrifice. Let me note here that St. Thomas does not treat the matter explicitly, and we shall, in interpreting his teaching, keep in mind the dogmatic teaching of the Church on the subject. "Alexander of Hales, St. Thomas, and some other Scholastics", writes Fr. Otten,[17] "give a detailed and minute description of the Mass, but none of them examine into the intimate nature of the Eucharistic Sacrifice".

The Council of Trent (Sess. XXII) defines the Mass as a true and proper sacrifice (can. I); that it is also propitiatory (can. II). It rejects the doctrine that the Mass is nothing more than Christ given to us as food (can. I), or a mere sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, or a nude commemoration of the sacrifice of the Cross (can III). Pius V condemned the teaching of Michael Du Bay who maintained that for no other reason is the Mass a sacrifice than that "sancta societate Deo homo inhaereat" (October, 1567). The Council of Trent (cap. 1, Sess. XXII) also defines that Christ left to the Church a sacrifice which according to the exigencies of man's nature was visible, wherein the one sacrifice is represented and its memory perpetuated to the end of time; and that, although the manner of offering is different, in the Mass we have the same "hostia", the same Christ now offering Himself through the ministry of priests, who then offered Himself on the Cross; and this without any derogation to the latter, since through the Mass the fruits of the Cross are most copiously received. It may be remarked that, contrary to the opinion of many, the word "immolare" here used is translated by "offered". The "Schema reformatum" of 1552 says: "nihil causae dici potest, quin Eucharistia quam Sacerdotes Sacra benedictione quae verbis fit quibus Catholica Ecclesia utitur tanquam forma Sacramenti conficiunt atque Deo offerunt verum ac proprium Sacrificium dici debeat." From this it seems clear that the Council of Trent used "immolare" as synonymous with "offerre".

St. Thomas does not make destruction an essential element of sacrifice. Destruction according to him had a twofold outward signification. It showed the destruction of sin; and it

[17] *History of Dogmas*, vol. II, p. 335.

signified that, because of sin, man deserved death. In sacrifices other than the Cross, it represented the Passion and Death of Christ. "Dicendum (est) quod animalia in sacrificium oblata occidebantur: quia veniunt in usum hominis occisa, secundum quod a Deo dantur homini ad esum: et ideo etiam igni cremebantur: quia per ignem decocta fiant apta humano esui. Similiter etiam per occisionem animalium significatur destructio peccatorum, et quod homines erant digni occisione pro peccatis suis ac si illa animalia loco eorum occiderentur ad significandam expiationem peccatorum: per occisionem etiam hujusmodi animalium significabatur occisio Christi."[18] Note here that the reasons are given why "living animals are not offered". St. Thomas does not regard destruction as a virtue. Its value derives from its being a means the better to express "divine reverence", while the offering of the blood is equivalent to the offering of life—an offering that is made as a recognition of God's dominion over life and all things. "Sunt tamen quidam actus, qui non habent ex alio laudem nisi quia fiunt propter reverentiam divinam: et isti actus proprie sacrificia dicuntur."[19] "Ex naturali ratione procedit quod homo quibusdam sensibilibus rebus utatur offerens eas deo in signum debitae subjectionis et honoris secundum similitudinem eorum qui dominis suis aliquae offerunt in recognitionem dominii. Hoc autem pertinet ad rationem sacrificii".[20] Hence in destruction the offering of life to secure "divinam reverentiam et honorem" is essential.

The deduction that destruction may in certain cases prepare the victim and render it more apt for sacrificial use, though death and destruction are not its sacrificial end, seems legitimate.

Death and burning are not the end or purpose of animals. Yet death and cooking by fire, in the case given, both signify and effect their present intended purpose. Flesh that is properly killed and cooked easily suggests that it is intended for food, and generally men consider such all the better for eating; though for this end neither is really essential. It is quite conceivable, however, that a master may require his servant to do

[18] Ia, IIae, Q. 102, art. 3, ad 5.
[19] IIa, IIae, Q. 85, art. 3 c.
[20] Ibid., art. 1 c.

both, before he will accept it. So too in sacrifice the death of Christ in itself was not necessary, save that His Father wished and ordained it. This to me is the point of analogy that St. Thomas wishes to drive home. The primary end of sacrifice with him is the act of supreme reverence and subjection to God—a subjection expressed in the highest act of worship: the outward sacrifice adequately signifying the inward. Now sacrifice is not with him the destruction of a thing, but the making it holy ("sacrum facere"). In its offering the victim becomes the outward thing that of itself, because of the manner of offering, is the actual external act of supreme worship. Further, the act of subjection and of submission to the dominion of God is not a constrained act of subjection to the divine power. To this power man was always necessarily subject. "Nunquam homo desiit Dei esse". It is rather a subjection and submission to God "per unionem charitatis ad Deum".[21] Such subjection involves the payment of a twofold debt: one because of life, health, conservation, and benefits received "ratione beneficii": the other because of sin committed "ratione peccati commissi". For the first, the sacrifice will render supreme homage with highest thanks, or latria. For the second, supreme homage with full satisfaction.[22] It is evident that sin cuts man off from this subjection to God "per unionem charitatis", "secundo vero modo desiit esse Dei per peccatum".[23] Therefore to restore this subjection the victim offered must be sinless in itself (even as Christ was and the victims offered in the old law were, for they were incapable of sin). It must also show in itself the destruction of the sins of those for whom it is offered: else as sacrificial victim it cannot fulfil its purpose of being the outward expression of that supreme worship to God which springs from entire subjection to Him "per unionem charitatis". How, it may be asked, can the victim show the destruction of sin? Clearly only in two ways: by actually bearing and manifesting in itself the punishment that God has laid down as a full atonement of sin, or else by effectively participating in that full atonement and in some way sufficiently expressing the fact. In either case the

[21] III, Q. 48, art. 4, ad 1.
[22] III, Supplementum, Q. 13, art. 1, C.
[23] III, Q. 48, art. 4.

victim, being sinless in itself, has also eliminateed what would render it disagreeable to God, and thus has become apt to fulfil the purpose of sacrifice. This seems to be the thought of St. Thomas. God loves all men "quantum ad naturam quam ipse fecit", and the Passion of Christ did not reconcile us to God in the sense that God began again to love us, but rather in the sense that the cause of hatred was taken away by the removal of sin, and by the "recompensation of a more acceptable good".[24] This more acceptable good seems to be, that Christ showed more love in the atonement than there was hatred in the offence; that the obedience whereby according to His Father's will He not only freely and lovingly took the sins of the whole world upon Himself, but patiently endured their punishment even to the smallest detail, far surpasses the disobedience in Adam's offence. Then His life, being the life of the God-man, was of surpassing dignity; while His sufferings were so complete and His grief and sorrow so great that of necessity His satisfaction for sin was superabundant.[25] When we consider the perfect love, obedience, and reverence with which in our stead, paying divine honor, He outwardly offered His sacred body and blood, bearing the full satisfaction for our sins, it cannot be but that His sacrifice was agreeable to God and effective *in se* of our complete subjection to Him "per modum charitatis". It therefore effected that, when properly applied, men should once again be admitted into a participation of God's inheritance, and again become adopted children of God. Thus it was not the sufferings merely *qua tales*, but the mystic offering of the God-man, by which His sufferings were offered and made to avail instead of ours, by which instead of ours His ineffable love and devotion and obedience, and wish to convey the highest subjection of God "per modum charitatis", all outwardly expressed themselves in His Passion and Death. These it was, that rendered the Cross agreeable to God unto His supreme honor and unto our complete reconciliation and redemption.

It is clear, then, that not the sufferings, but rather the mystic internal offering and love of the sufferer, are the essential and

[24] III, Q. 49, art. 4, ad 1 and 2.
[25] Vide III, Q. 48, art. 2 c & seq. 49.

formal element which enhances, beautifies, and renders sufferings ennobling and acceptable. Here we have the reason why St. Thomas insists on the internal dispositions.

Another consideration will help us to understand what has yet to be said. The fact that, according to His Father's will, Christ suffered and satisfied for us, gives Him the right and power according to that same divine will, of transferring and applying to us all that we require, so that we may be really "adopted sons" of God on earth, and receive and enjoy our inheritance in heaven. Christ is the second Adam, giving us the inheritance Adam had lost. Thus He is our Head, and by spiritual regeneration we are His mystic children and may become like Himself.

III.

We may now more minutely consider the sacrifice of the Mass. In the Mass, St. Thomas teaches, there is no real destruction of Christ. Even at the last Supper, He tells us, our Lord was present under the Sacred Species in a way that excluded suffering: "Impassibili tamen modo erat sub specie sacramenti quod in se erat passibile, sicut invisibiliter quod in se erat visibile, ergo dicendum quod Christus dicitur in Coena non dedisse corpus suum mortale et passibile quia non dedit mortali et passibili modo." [26] Then as Christ is wholly present in each and every part even the minutest, just as before the change the substance of bread and wine was so present, it follows that a destruction and breaking of Christ's body and blood are impossible. Finally the glorified Christ is incorruptible. "Non autem potest dici ipsum corpus Christi verum frangatur: primo quidem, quia est incorruptible et impassibile: secundo quia est totum sub utra qualibet parte . . . est contra rationem ejus quod frangitur." [27] This same doctrine is embodied in the words of his well-known Eucharistic hymn: "Nec status nec statura signati minuitur." It is clear then that St. Thomas teaches no destruction of Christ in the Mass. How then can the Human Nature of the Saviour become therein a proper and acceptable victim of sacrifice? Because of its

[26] III, Q. 81, art. 3, c and 1.
[27] III, Q. 77, art. 7, C.

effective and complete participation in the atonement of the Cross, with a sufficient outward expression of this fact of participation. "Dicendum quod duplici ratione celebratio hujus sacramenti dicitur immolatio Christi: primo quidem quia sicut dicit August. ad Simplicianum".[28] "Solent imagines earum rerum nominibus appelari quarum imagines sunt: sicut cum intuentes tabulam aut parietem pictum dicimus Iste Cicero est, ille Salustius. Celebratio autem hujus sacramenti . . . imago quaedam est representativa passionis Christi quae est vera ejus immolatio . . . aliomodo quantum ad effectum passionis Christi quia scilicet per hoc sacramentum participes efficimur fructus dominicae passionis: unde in quadem dominicali oratione secreta dicitur: Quoties hujus hostiae commemoratio celebratur opus nostrae redemptionis exercetur".[29] Surely, suffering is not sought for itself (a condemned doctrine), but for its effect. Provided the effect is obtained, the end is secured. From this passage it is quite clear that in the Mass, the effect or atonement of the Cross is secured, for he tells us expressly that we are hereby made partakers of the Lord's Passion.

Further on in this same article (Res. ad. 1, 2, 3) St. Thomas brings out more clearly how the Mass outwardly signifies the Sacrifice of the Cross. He says that "it is one and the same" victim that Christ and we offer; that the celebration of this sacrament is a representative image of Christ's Passion; that the principal minister is the same, since the priest pronounces the words of consecration in the person and with the power of Christ "in cujus persona et virtute verba pronuntiat ad consecrandum". If the offering up of Christ in mere figure was sufficient to render the sacrifices of the Old Law real and pleasing to God, how much more so is this true of the Mass, wherein is offered Christ Himself—a thing peculiar to Mass, bearing and showing in His Sacred Body and Blood a real, true, and full participation of the atonement of the Cross, as an apt victim more agreeable to God and as a real and proper sacrifice. Since the actual offering is a supreme act of homage and worship to God—surely God is appeased and forgives sin, "just as a man likewise overlooks an offence committed against him on account of a pleasing act of reverence shown him."[30]

[28] Lib. 2, Q. 3, ante med.
[29] III, Q. 83, art. 1, c.
[30] III, Q. 49, art. 4 c.

Finally, as the God-man Christ, our Mediator, and Head of His mystical body, made His flesh, wherein he endured the Passion, the instrument of His Godhead, so that His suffering operated with divine power to expel sin, and to deliver us, His mystic members, from the same,[31] we can readily understand how He could make this same sacred flesh in the Mass, to contain and express the atonement of the Cross, and so become an agreeable and meet victim of sacrifice (or sacred thing showing highest worship to God). For according to the Council of Trent (Sess. VII, Can. 6) the sacraments contain the grace which they confer. The Sacrament of the Altar, as a victim of sacrifice, likewise contains the effects of the atonement, which it copiously confers. Since the Council of Trent brought out clearly what was implied in the Saint's teaching regarding the sacraments, and since, as we have seen, the Saint teaches that the fruits of the Cross are conferred on us through the Mass, the conclusion appears legitimate that in the Mass also the victim offered contains the full effects of the atonement of the Cross. These were shown on the Cross by the actual pouring out of the Precious Blood, while in the Mass they are represented by mystic effusion, since the manner of offering is different. What secures all this in the Mass is the Consecration. "Hoc sacramentum perficitur in Consecratione Eucharistiae in qua sacrificium Deo offertur ad quod sacerdos obligatur Deo ex ordine jam suscepto."[32] These words change the substance of bread into the Body of Christ, offering that sacred Body under the species wholly and entirely to God. "Sub speciebus panis est quidem corpus Christi ex vi sacramenti. . . . In passione et cujus hoc sacramentum est memoriale non fuerint aliae corporis partes ab invicem separatae . . . sed corpus indissolutum remansit secundum quod legitur quod 12. Nec os illius confringetis".[33] The words of consecration also change the whole substance of wine into the substance of Christ's most Precious Blood, offering the same to God under the species, while expressly mentioning the fact that this most Precious Blood is being poured out unto the remission of sins, "Hoc valet ad repraesentandam passionem Christi; in qua seorsum

[31] III, Q. 49, art. 1.
[32] III, Q. IV, 82, art. 10 ad 1.
[33] III, Q. 76, art. II, c ad 2.

fuit sanguis a corpore separatus: unde in forma consecrationis sanguinis fit mentio de ejus effusione." The Saint mentions the effect of the consecration. "Sacrificia veteris legis illud verum sacrificium passionis Christi continebant solum in figura secundum illud Hebr. 10, 'Umbram habens lex futurorum bonorum non ipsam verum imaginem'; et ideo opportuit ut aliquid plus haberat sui sacrificium novae legis a Christo institutum: ut scilicet contineret ipsum Christum passum, non solum in significatione vel figura sed etiam in rei veritate: et ideo hoc sacramentum, quod ipsum Christum realiter continet ut Dionysius dicit 3 cap. eccl. Hierarch. (vers. fin.) est perfectivum omnium aliorum sacramentorum in quibus virtus Christi participatur." [34] Clearly this sacrament contains Christ Himself, but how, before He actually suffered, could it contain "Ipsum Christum passum non solum in significatione vel figura sed etiam in rei veritate"? There seems no other answer than that already given; to wit, that our Saviour, even then as God-man and Head of the Church, held all the fruits of His Passion in His Sacred Flesh and Blood; and that, while outwardly signifying the root and source of these as sacrifice required, He could copiously apply them to His mystic members. "Passum" clearly shows the effects or fruits of what He suffered. The Mass is a memorial of the Cross: and God, since He did not need it, wishes the outward sacrifice for us, that it might the more excite our love, awake our sense of God's justice in remembering what Christ suffered, etc. We know that Christ forgave sins long before the Last Supper; and as no human sin ever was forgiven save through the atonement of the Cross, it ought to be clear that our Saviour possessed and could dispose even then of the fruits of His passion. Note also how, according to St. Thomas, it is the consecration, or mystic blessing of the priest that offers and consecrates in sacrifice the Sacred Body and Blood of Christ. Thus His teaching is exactly the same as that already mentioned in the *schema reformatum* of the Council of Trent. "Nihil causae dici potest quin Eucharistia, quam sacerdotes sacra benedictione quae verbis fit quibus Catholica Ecclesia utitur tamquam forma sacramenti, conficiunt atque deo offerunt verum ac proprium sacrificium dici debeat."

[34] III, Q. 75, art. 1 c.

It is easy then to see where Fr. de La Taille's theory, to which of late so much attention has been drawn, differs from that of St. Thomas. Fr. de La Taille makes the Mass the " oblatio victimae aut immolandae aut immolatae ". St. Thomas makes it the oblation of " Christi passi ". It may be noted also that this sacrament is " perfectivum omnium aliorum Sacramentorum ", because, as the Saint elsewhere tells us, " ordinati communicant et etiam baptizati si sint adulti ".[35] Thus, whatever perfection is received from any sacrament, a further perfection may yet be received from the Blessed Eucharist. It is impossible therefore to agree with the statement that all other sacraments derive their value from it, the Eucharist.[36] Baptism, for example, as St. Thomas taught, is fruitful only if there be what he calls a " votum " of the Eucharist contained in it. St. Thomas shows clearly that the Mass derives all its effects from the Cross, and so must these.

The question remains whether, if Christ merited when He offered the sacrifice of the Mass, must the Mass derive its effects from the sacrifice of the Cross? Every action of our Saviour was meritorious by means of His free will, and His unspeakable charity.[37] Therefore His offering of Mass at the Last Supper was meritorious. Yet Christ could only merit for Himself such things as would give, when merited, more to His dignity and perfection than their absence would take therefrom. Thus Christ could not merit knowledge, for if we conceived that He once lacked knowledge it would take more from His perfection and dignity than He could ever obtain by meriting and acquiring it. Thus Christ could only merit the glory of His Body and whatever pertained to His outward excellence, such as His resurrection, ascension, veneration, etc.[38] Further note that these are not merited " vi sacrificii sed ex ipsa devotione qua secundum charitatem humiliter passionem sustinuit ".[39] Yet these Christ could not apply to us save in the way His Father laid down. Now, as all admit, His Father decreed, that this way was the actual payment,

[35] III, Q. 65, art. 3 c.
[36] *Irish Eccl. Record*, Jan., 1923, p. 48.
[37] In Sent. III, Q. 18, art. 2.
[38] III, Q. 19, art. 3.
[39] III, Q. 22, art. 4 ad 2.

through His sufferings and death, of the debt due to sins. As this actual payment took place only on the Cross, it follows that only through the Cross can the Mass be meritorious for us. Hence St. Thomas insists that the Mass must participate in the fruits of he Cross. Further, Christ did not offer the sacrifice of the Cross, nor the Mass, for Himself, since He needed no sacrifice: He offered them for us. He did not therefore receive any fruit therefrom for Himself "vi sacrificii". Indirectly, however, as St. Thomas points out, Christ might be said to offer sacrifice for Himself, for inasmuch as He had human nature, His sacred Flesh, though without sin, bore a certain resemblance to sin, God sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh . . . of sin hath condemned sin in the flesh". "Christus autem simpliciter loquendo peccatum non habuit: habuit tamen similitudinem peccati in carne, ut dicitur Rom. VIII, et ideo non simpliciter dicendum est quod ipse effectum sacerdotii participavit sed secundum quid, scilicet secundum passibilitatem carnis; unde signanter dicit: Qui possit illum salvum facere a morte".[40] Thus all the merits of the Mass come from the Cross.

To summarize. St. Thomas teaches that in the Mass, as on the Cross, we have the same priest, the same victim, the same sacrifice, the same atonement, showing itself differently. On the Cross it is actual through participation of its fruits in the Mass. Both are offered to give supreme glory to God and to effect man's salvation. It is the mystic blessing of the priest or words of consecration, that under the species of bread and wine offers to God Christ's Sacred Body and Blood, and consecrates them, a sacred thing showing and bearing the fruits of the atonement and paying God supreme worship.

JOS. BRODIE BROSNAN.

Rochdale, England.

[40] III, Q. 22, art. 4 c.

ECONOMICS OF AQUINAS.

ST. THOMAS does not scorn, but rather accentuates, a material element in the purpose of civil society: declaring, as he does, that the necessaries of life must be made available to each and every member of the State, and even insisting that, otherwise, the State cannot survive.[1] Civil society is perfect in so far as it assures the individual of the requirements of a good livelihood.[2] He further reveals his mind by quoting Valerius Maximus to the effect that the old Romans preferred to be poor in a rich state to being rich in a poor one.[3]

Thus it is fundamental to Aquinas as a political economist that civil society should ameliorate the struggle for existence, though it is clear that he is far from approving that paternalism which ignores or discountenances individual effort. Nor is his a Spencerian attitude of "the man versus the state": rather, he holds that the State should help the individual to help himself. We deduce, then, that he looks to the State not only to assist in regulating gainful labor but also to see that it may be had; for, without such labor, society does not furnish a sufficiency of things necessary, and then the common good, ever the aim of Thomistic politics and economics, is seriously impaired. He teaches not only that men should work, but also maintains that every man has the right to work. He offers four proofs:

First, and principally, mouths must be fed. The voice of Genesis vibrates through human destiny, and "work" is written large on Life. Without labor, man cannot comply with the law of self-preservation.

Secondly, idleness is as much the source of evils as work may be the means of blessings. Virtue is in close relation to industry.

Thirdly, through labor, the call of the flesh is less insistent, concupiscence restrained, and the spirit purged.

Fourthly, men must have work and wages to fulfil the Christian law of charity. In this, Aquinas seems to recognize that the honest hard-serving person is entitled not only to the re-

[1] *De Regimine*, Lib. I, cap. 13.
[2] Ibid., I, i.
[3] *Summa Theol.*, IIa IIae, Qu. XLVII, a. X, ad 2.

quisites of life but also to a surplus. Every man has a sort of right to the happiness of helping those that cannot help themselves.[4] The possessors of money are the stewards of it, and out of their abundance they must succor the less fortunate; and indeed no greater luxury can be purchased with riches than the joys of charity.

From labor, the logical transition in the Thomistic doctrine of economic purpose is to the topics of money and taxation. In the *De Regimine*, two sets of reasons are advanced for coinage: first, the image of the sovereign is stamped on the pieces of gold and silver, and nothing can keep the memory of the representatives of law and order (and hence of all civic ideals) more green than this frequent passing from hand to hand of the inscribed coin of the realm.[5] Secondly, money is a convenience for the people, and, duly accredited by the stamp of the State, it saves them from fraud. Thus in the time of Christ, when Roman ascendancy was supreme, there was only one kind of coin in the empire, and Cæsar's image frowned from it, for justice as well as domination.[6]

St. Thomas's views on money should be of interest to an age of finance like ours. For him, specie is primarily an instrument of exchange,[7] for the general welfare and not for the amassing of private fortunes. As the peculiar conditions of his day required, he does not regard it as productive, but as the symbol of production. For him it is wrong that anything should be sold for more than a just price.[8] Even in cases where cheating does not figure, it must be borne in mind that buying and selling are transactions for the benefit of both parties concerned, one supplying what the other lacks; and the equity of the relation should be perfect. If the price exceeds the value of the object, or conversely, justice is injured; and therefore to sell too dearly or to buy too cheaply is wrong.[9] But Aquinas introduces the instance in which a man, supplying a purchaser, suffers a loss over and

[4] *Summa Theol.*, IIa IIae, Qu. CLXXXVII, a. 3.

[5] *De Reg.*, Lib. II, cap. 13. Section not written, but rather influenced by St. Thomas.

[6] Ibidem.

[7] Ibidem.

[8] *Summa Theol.*, IIa IIae, Qu. LXXVII, a. i.

[9] *Com. Polit.*, Lib. I, cap. 6, et *Com. Eth.*, Lib. V, cap. 5, et *Summa Theol.*, IIa IIae, Qu. LXXVII, a. i.

above the intrinsic value of the transferred article; and declares that, then, something over and above the actual worth may be asked. Finally, none should sell what is not absolutely his own.[10]

The law must disallow whatever injures the social life of men ("quae destruunt hominum convictum"); but St. Thomas realizes that legal influence is limited and that, if civil society had to depend on it solely, too many men in the State would probably need to be personally policed. So he tells the profiteer of God's vision which pierces every deceit, and of His justice which exacts the last farthing. To be sure, the State should do as much as it can to secure justice; yet the final issue is with the individual himself, whom Aquinas always refuses to sacrifice and in whose powers for good he does not easily surrender confidence. However, this does not prevent him from explaining the State's duty in the matter. Standardization, he teaches, must vary in different places, according to supply and demand; hence, in every polity the government should reflect on conditions and then determine the standard of justice. The rulings of just authority or custom in this regard must not be transgressed.[11]

The Angelic Doctor mentions varieties of fraud in business —(a) adulteration of goods; (b) false measure; (c) misrepresentation of merchandise.[12] In these directions the eye of the State must search and the weight of law be wielded. Profit should be permitted only when its purpose is honest and necessary. Lucre is never to be sought as the end of business, but as the reward of honorable labor.[13] Aquinas believes that every man should have opportunity to make enough money, by brawn or brain, for his own present and future needs and his family's, and that excess profit, when permissible, ought to be inspired by and devoted to altruistic aims. He judges a man by what he is, not by what he has; he insinuates that, if a man has more than he should have, he is not what he ought to be. He does not decry money-holders, but rather greed, trick-

[10] *Summa*, ibidem.
[11] *Summa Theol.*, IIa IIae, Qu. LXXVII, a. II, ad 2.
[12] Ibidem.
[13] *Summa Theol.*, IIa IIae, Qu. LXXVII, a. 4.

ery and inordinate selfishness.[14] Here again he inculcates the Christian principle and spirit of the stewardship of wealth. In the ideal state, strength must supplement weakness; and surplus gain should be devoted, not through civil coercion, indeed, the office of which is limited mostly to social essentials, but, through the free and noble spirit of the opulent individual, to social improvement.

He further solves the problem of distribution with that doctrine of his that money is not fructive of itself. For him, interest may be quite unjust, because, by it, "that is sold which is not". No one should be required to pay for the use of a thing when the use means the loss of it; for then one would be paying for the same thing twice. This, medievally, is the case with money.[15] Whereas the modern conception is very different. To-day the purpose of money is subordinate to its possibilities. A thing in itself that can be handled and hoarded, money invites accumulation, too often loses its original innocence, and departs on a career of economic crime in which it is abetted and approved by the rather abused non-Thomistic idea that, like a living thing, it increases and multiplies.

St. Thomas believes that lack of state action on the abuse of money may be excusable on the ground that human laws are naturally limited in scope, because of human imperfection, and that much evil is often permitted in order that more good may not be impeded.[16] Though he would surely sanction intervention to-day, when the individual conscience is comparatively dull and justice so readily accedes to Mammon.

He concedes that whoever makes a loan with risk or sacrifice may exact a degree of interest. But the spirit of his doctrine is for free and ready lending, with humanity and benevolence for their own reward.[17] He would have social rein-

[14] Cf. Aristotle's teaching that courage is intended to inspire fortitude, not to earn money; that the end of the soldier's and physician's vocation is victory and health, not gain; that it is unjust and unseemly to make the higher motive less than the lower.—*Politics*, I, 9.

[15] See Von Roey, *La Monnaie d'après Saint Thomas d'Aquin, Revue Néo-Scolastique*, XII, 1905. For Thomistic doctrine on money, beyond the *Summa*, III *Sent., dist.* XXXVII, Qu. I, a. 6. Quodlibeta, III, a. XIX. De Malo, Qu. XIII, a. 4. De Emptione et Venditione ad tempus, In duo praecepta caritatis et in decem Legis praecepta expositio (c. XXIV), et in psalmos Davidis expositio (ps. XIV), (Von Roey).

[16] *Summa Theol.*, IIa IIae, Qu. LXXVIII, a. I, ad 3.

[17] Ibid., ad 4.

forcement possible to every worthy individual: having confidence in every one that has not forfeited the right to it, and even then the spirit of his writings evinces that he has hope; while in any event he has charity.

The substance of Thomistic doctrine on a more equitable distribution of wealth, therefore, seems to be:

1. That man's right to life includes the right to the means of sustaining it, as well as protecting and perfecting it: work. And this necessitates that the State endeavor to provide opportunity for all; and since civil authority does not defend without first defining, the right of the individual to employment should be made the subject of legislation.[18] Such at least is a legitimate inference from the Doctor's principles of the common weal, the protectorate character of the state, the guarantee of law, and the supremacy of right.

2. The State must not assume the place of the individual, but enable him, in so far as it is fitting and necessary, to play his own part and play it well.

3. Private wealth should be repressed to proportions of justice, (a) by the civil action of fair and standard prices, and (b) by a prudent supervision of interest.

4. The spirit of charity and fraternity should be fostered and spread.

Under the economic mission of the State is to be considered also the question of taxation. The government is not to seek its own interest or glory, but the people's. The fire of Ezechiel's diction is hurled by St. Thomas against avaricious polities, "like wolves ravening the prey to shed blood, and to destroy souls, and to run after gains through covetousness."[19] "Woe to the shepherds of Israel," he cries with the Prophet, "that feed themselves: should not the flocks be fed by the shepherds? You ate the milk, and you clothed yourself with wool, and you killed that which was fat: but my flock you did not feed."[20] Only in real necessity, such as national defence, or the fitting support of the administrators of the gov-

[18] Cf. Karl Müeller, *Die Arbeit, nach den moral, philosophischen Grundsaetzen des hl. Thomas von Aquin*, 1912, p. 93. Also, *S. Thomae Contra Retrahentes Hom. a Relig. Ingressu.* Cf. Ratzinger, *Geschichte der kirchlichen Armenpflege*, 1884, p. 541.

[19] Ezech. 22:27.

[20] Ezech. 34:2, 3.

ernment, are taxes to be levied; and then, the Doctor observes, it is only rational that the people render that with which their common utility is served.[21] Aquinas democratically regards taxes from the viewpoint of those on whom they are laid, rather than from that of those by whom. If taxes result in ultimate advantage to the people, they are just;[22] if not, the State has stumbled in its mission.

Taxes must always be moderate. And if a ruler greedily exacts more than is meet, he is guilty of grave wrong, and is bound to restitution.[23]

Aquinas is of the conviction that the old Hebrew economic regulations suitably directed human relations; but he is conscious that this would not be so, unless religion, which is an essential element of his political thought, were in men's lives. The necessity of the Church and its influence is axiomatic to his doctrine. To forget this would be to smile at some of his monitions, which are so alien to the hard business wisdom of the world. To remember it, is to ponder.

In fine, we may sum up his solution of economic, and in fact of most political problems too, in two words: justice and the Church. The latter holds aloft the former as a light to the world, diffusing authority and advising how high principles may be best realized in the lowly affairs of life; saving the individual and his rights from unnatural theory; teaching him to live and let live, to help and be helped, to rejoice and be glad, to suffer and be patient, to realize the liberty of law, the equality of human nature, and the fraternity which is founded on the paternity of God and the catholic redemption of His Son. The Doctor's first service consists of the fact that he not only prescribes a remedy, but also tells us where and how it is to be found; his second, in the further fact that his doctrine, far from injuring democracy, like many of our theories to-day, truly advances it. Whereas the individual, the symbol of democracy, would be wholly submerged in the socialistic sea, he rises full-formed, efficient and panoplied with all his rights, from the brow of the medieval scholar-saint.

EDWARD F. MURPHY, S.S.J.

Baltimore, Maryland.

[21] *De Reg. Judaeorum ad Ducissam Brabantiae.* [22] Ibid.
[23] *Summa,* IIa IIae, Qu. LXVI, a. 8, ad 3.

SAINT THOMAS THE PREACHER.

THIS title will come as a shock to some perhaps. They will think of the *Summa Theologica* as a mine for the preacher who knows how to use it and is prepared to work exceedingly hard. But we should have a very false notion of the "Angel of the Schools" if we pictured him simply as the University professor or the student pondering at his desk, or even as the contemplative engaged in prayer. For St. Thomas was a preacher and a copious one. "Since," says his biographer, William of Tocco, "he was thus uplifted to God and hence full of charity toward his neighbor, he so framed his sermons, whereby he hoped to please God and profit his neighbor, that they might be, not models of human words and wisdom, but models of the wisdom and power of speech. Hence in his sermons he laid aside the subtleties of Scholastic disputation, with the result that his hearers listened to him with deepest reverence, for they felt that his preaching came straight from God."

Yet St. Thomas's claim on posterity is based so naturally and inevitably on his theological writings that his work as a preacher has always been neglected. In 1670 a volume of his sermons was published at Rome from MS. still in the Vatican library. In 1881 these sermons were republished in convenient form by Canon Raulx,[1] who added another volume containing the more purely dogmatic sermons of the Saint, those, for example, on the Creed, on the Human Nature of Christ and on His Second Coming, on the Decalogue, the Lord's Prayer, the Hail Mary, etc. It is much to be regretted that these volumes are so little known. In an age of hurry when priests are often pressed for a sermon, and when a "skeleton" which can be digested and made one's own is an invaluable help, these sermons of St. Thomas would prove a veritable mine to the priest who is prepared to work. For one has to work at them. They have to be digested. But the thoughts are there. Moreover they are not buried in a wilderness of words. For these sermons, as we now have them, are for the most part little more than digests; they give one the impression that they are the actual notes the Saint framed preparatory to delivery.

[1] *Divi Thomae Aquinatis Doctoris Angelici Sermones et Opuscula Concionatoria*, ed. A. J-B. Raulx, Paris, 1881, Soc. de S. Paul.

It will be worth while to run through the contents of the first volume. It comprises no less than two-hundred and seventy-five sermons. There are sixteen for Advent; twenty-two for Christmas to Septuagesima; forty-seven for Septuagesima to Easter; twenty-four from Easter to Pentecost; seventy-nine for Pentecost and the following Sundays; fifty-eight for the feasts of Saints; eight for feasts of Our Lady, etc. Unfortunately we are afforded very few hints concerning the time or place of delivery, though two of the Advent sermons were preached, one before the University of Paris, the other before that of Bologna. In the former St. Thomas contrasts the spiritual man with the worldly man; in the latter he shows the difference between works of darkness and works of light. But in either case we have the merest outlines preserved to us. Still it is good to see how the Saint worked, how he set out his thoughts and arranged his ideas. One feature of all these sermon notes will—we say it with all respect—prove a stumbling-block to many preachers: the notes are almost fifty per cent texts of Scripture. We can see that St. Thomas's mind was such a storehouse of Scripture that his thoughts naturally expressed themselves in the familiar words. He did not have to use a Concordance; he did not have to look up the appropriate passages; they simply flowed out from his memory. The consequence is that to us the sequence of ideas is often far from clear. When we try to preach these sermons we find ourselves hampered by our lack of similar familiarity with the text of Scripture, and, alas, by a similar lack on the part of our hearers. Yet it is worth while reflecting that the actual words of Scripture are "sacramental," that people recognize them as such, and that they do convey grace to human souls.

We shall get a fairer idea of these sermons however, if we take one or two practically at random. Here is a sermon, or rather a Gospel passage, on which we all have to preach at some time or another. It is the story of the Pharisee and the Publican. St. Thomas gives us four sermons for that Sunday, the eleventh after Pentecost. The fourth is on the prayer of the Publican. How does he treat it? I shall give it *in extenso*.

God, be merciful to me a sinner! This is the prayer of a sinner begging mercy from God. First, he sets forth what may win God's kindly good will: *God.* Secondly, he states his petition: *be merciful.* Thirdly he assigns a reason for his petition: *to me a sinner.*

With regard to the first, note that for three reasons we can firmly trust that God will show mercy to all who ask Him: first, because He is full of mercy: *God, who is rich in mercy,* Ephes. 2:4. Secondly, because it is God's prerogative to show mercy, as St. Gregory says: "God, whose prerogative it is always to show mercy and to spare", or, as Isaias says, *Let the impious man leave his way and the wicked man his thoughts, and let him return to the Lord, and He will show him mercy,* Isaias 54:7. Thirdly, because God has the long-standing habit of showing mercy; from eternity to eternity He pours out His mercy upon them that fly to Him: *The mercy of the Lord is from eternity to eternity for them that fear Him,* Ps. 102:17.

With regard to the second point, note that the prayer he formulates is exceedingly good for three reasons. First, by reason of its brevity: *When ye pray speak not much, as the heathens do. For they think that in their much speaking they may be heard,* Mt. 6:7. Secondly by reason of the necessity it expresses, for he is here asking for pardon, which all men need: *If we say that we have no sin we deceive ourselves and the truth is not in us,* I Jno. 1:8; and, as Augustine says: "You will find nothing praiseworthy in a man's life if when you dissect it you omit the detail of mercy." Thirdly, by reason of the profit accruing from asking for the remission of our sins and the inpouring of grace, whence *This man went down justified rather than the other.*

As regards the third point, notice that a sinner who wishes God to be merciful to him must have the three things which this Publican had: first, deep humility and contrition of heart, *A humble and contrite heart, O God, Thou wilt not despise,* Ps. 1:19; secondly, the actual confession of his sins: *He prayed thus within himself: O God, be merciful to me a sinner;* hence *He that hideth his sins shall not be guided, but he that confesses them and leaves them shall find mercy,* Prov. 28:13; and again, *I said I will confess to the Lord mine unrighteousness, against myself, and Thou didst forgive the iniquity of my sin,* Ps. 31:5; thirdly, punishment or satisfaction, *he struck his breast,* and, as saith Augustine, "he exacted punishment of himself", or, *bring forth fruits worthy of penance,* Lk. 3:8.

This is the whole sermon. Clearly it could not be preached exactly as it stands. These then are merely notes to be filled out. Yet the whole outline is there. Anyone can grasp it and make it his own and deliver it as a practical sermon.

It will be of interest, too, to note the subjects of which St. Thomas treated when dealing with the various Sunday Epistles and Gospels on which we too have to preach. As we look through these Sunday sermons we find him dealing with such subjects as interior sanctity, the cry of the world for God, man's perfection, the search for God, hospitality, the leprosy of sin, the soul's union with God, the three things that go to make a saint, the three kinds of peace, true joy, etc. And these subjects are additional to the ordinary themes suggested by the seasons of the ecclesiastical year.

Most of these sermons are, as we have said, little more than skeletons. But some are much more fully developed. Thus there are two on the goodness of God in sending us the Holy Spirit, and in these we seem to have the actual words as the preacher delivered them. He begins by showing that without God we can not think, understand, speak, or act; each of these points is developed, and then we are shown how the "Gift" of the Holy Spirit is accompanied by the five things which make a gift perfect, for it is given with care, efficaciously, generously, abundantly, and is an actually present thing. In what is termed "the second portion of the sermon," but which is apparently a separate sermon, St. Thomas shows how this gift meets the needs of the sinner and of the good man alike. The sinner is taught, assisted, and restrained from doing evil, his passions are extinguished and virtue is formed in his soul. The good man on the other hand is consoled during life and taught not to fear, at death he is assisted; in safety he is brought to God; it is the Holy Spirit who raises up his mortal body at the resurrection and who is the source of his happiness in heaven.

Even these two sermons, however, full and detailed as they are, can hardly have been preached as they now stand, for they seem too purely didactic. The truth is, of course, that we cannot judge of thirteenth-century sermons by present-day standards. However illiterate the people may have been they were in a very true sense far better educated than the ordinary congregation of to-day. They had an immense advantage in their inability to read. Their minds had not become atrophied by the empty ephemeral literature (!) of the present day. They had leisure to think; the spoken word was their food; prob-

ably—just because they were capable of hard thinking—they criticized sermons just as severely as the modern man thinks he does. But they could follow a stiff dialectical sermon and they could enjoy it. The proof lies in the fact that such sermons were delivered by Saints who were not fools and who would not "throw their pearls before swine". What more uncultivated auditory could one imagine than the crowds who thronged to St. Augustine's sermons at Hippo and at Carthage! Yet what dialectical and doctrinal sermons he preached to them! Did they understand him? Probably at times they did not. But as a general rule they must have understood, else we cannot imagine him preaching the same type of sermon to them for thirty-five years. Moreover as we read these sermons we realize what an infinity of pains he took to make them understand.

It must have been the same with St. Thomas. It would be idle to expect of him such "Missionary" sermons as those of St. Vincent Ferrer, with their homely illustrations and their pungent wit and humor. The "Angel of the Schools" might, as Tocco says that he did, lay aside Scholastic methods, but he must always have preached as the theologian *par excellence*. Yet it is precisely this feature of his sermons that makes them so valuable to us. First of all he makes you think. You can run your eye down the page and you have got—nothing! You can analyze his thought and you have got—a sermon? No, ten or twelve sermons! But you have to work. And it is the work which makes the sermon yours; it is the work, too, which enables your hearers to take away your sermon as theirs.

Take another example. We all have to preach on the Unjust Steward. Probably when we have done it once we dread doing it again, for the difficulties of the parable are notorious. Now St. Thomas has two sermons on it. They were preached on the same day and to the same audience. He calls the second one a "conference"; he would seem to have been giving a species of "retreat". We have no hesitation in saying that anyone who carefully analyzes these two sermons will have material for a ten-days' retreat—if any of his audience remained after the first day! How does the Saint proceed? The first sermon deals with the steward's master. He is depicted by Christ as a man, so as to help us. But it is really God who is set before us. Yet talking with us men He be-

haves as a man, "just as if," says St. Thomas, "you talked in French with a Frenchman, people would say 'Why, you are talking like a Frenchman!'". He then passes on to treat of God's wealth, and here he tells us a story: Two suitors sought a girl's hand in marriage; one was rich but a fool; the other was poor but no fool. The girl's father went for advice to a friend who said, "I would prefer a man without riches to riches without a man!"[2] God, says St. Thomas, has both wisdom and riches, and on this thought he dwells at great length. At the close he touches briefly on those who are God's stewards and incidentally gives us another little story from a sermon falsely attributed to St. Chrysostom.

For the evening conference the Saint took the steward himself as depicted in the Gospel. But this steward stands for mankind in general to whom God has entrusted three things: himself—and this puts him apart from the rest of the animal creation; spiritual good things, and temporal possessions. He then deals with man's power to abuse his trust. Apropos of this he quotes the well-known words of Terence, "Homo sum, nihil a me humani alienum puto," a sentence which, so St. Augustine tells us, "was applauded to the echo by the entire theatre, by wise men and fools alike."[3] Lastly, St. Thomas dwells on the terrible danger of misuse of God's gifts.

In these two sermons, which are longer than most, we see the Saint and the University professor, who is always a man, and who from his profound study of God, and of God made Man for our sake, had learned the lesson of sympathy for man who would be made God!

Readers of St. Augustine's sermons must often have noticed the concluding formula, which is, so far as we are aware, never given in full in the printed editions, "Conversi ergo ad Deum".[4] It is interesting to note the formulae used by St. Thomas and presumably customary in his day: "Rogemus, etc.", "Rogemus Dominum, etc.", "Quod nobis praestare dignetur qui cum Patre, etc.". These were evidently prayers well known to all, but alas not preserved for us in their complete form.

HUGH POPE, O.P.

Rugby, England.

[2] "Malo virum indigentem divitiis quam divitias indigentes viro."

[3] Ep. CLV. 14.

[4] *E. g. Sermo* CCCXXIV; *Patr. Lat.* XXXVIII. 1426. See *Journal of Theological Studies*, Jan. 1912, p. 271.

Analecta.

ACTA PII PP. XI.

De Ordinariorum Facultatibus Quinquennalibus.

PIUS PP. XI.

Post datam instructionem et statutam normam pro facultatum quinquennalium concessione, complures Episcopi, sive singulatim, sive coniunctim, a Nobis enixe efflagitarunt, ne inolitus iam et vetustus mos mutaretur has facultates obtinendi unico folio typis impresso et ab uno Officio distribuendo. Gravamen enim esse sibi dicebant tot Officia adire, idque facere non posse nisi ope procuratorum et non sine incommodis atque dispendiis.

Quae quidem omnia quum Nobis visa sint digna consideratione, ad gratificandum Episcopis et ad faciliorem ipsis reddendam suarum Ecclesiarum administrationem, praesentibus Litteris *motu proprio* et *certa scientia* statuimus et decernimus, ut in posterum facultates quinquennales, intra limites praefinitos et sub formulis exhibitis die 17 martii 1922, ab una Sacra Congregatione tribuantur, apud quam omnes Episcopi, non obnoxii iurisdictioni sive Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide, sive Sacrae Congregationis pro Ecclesia Orientali, relationes suas dioecesanas deferre tenentur, hoc est a Sacra Congregatione Consistoriali. Ministri autem Sacrae Congregationis Consistorialis, saltem ante initium cuiuscumque quinquennii, a singulis S. Sedis Officiis requirent an in " facul-

tatibus quinquennalibus" aliqua mutatio perficienda sit, eamque in formulis, quae distribuendae deinde erunt, adamussim introducent. Praesentibus valituris, contrariis quibusvis, etiam peculiari mentione dignis, non obstantibus.

Datum Romae apud Sanctum Petrum, die XX mensis aprilis anno MCMXXIII, Pontificatus Nostri secundo.

PIUS PP. XI.

DIARIUM ROMANAE CURIAE.

PONTIFICAL HONORS.

20 March: Count Oscar Bopp de Oberstadt, of the Diocese of Rockford, Privy Chamberlain of Sword and Cape.

26 March: Monsignori John T. Kelly and Joseph A. O'Sullivan, of the Diocese of Hamilton, Domestic Prelates.

12 April: Monsignor Thomas H. McLaughlin, of the Diocese of Newark, Domestic Prelate.

17 April: Monsignor John Brennan, of the Diocese of Auckland, Privy Chamberlain supernumerarius.

19 April: Monsignor Francis J. Van Antwerp, of the Diocese of Detroit, Protonotary Apostolic *ad instar participantium*; and Monsignor John M. Doyle, of the Diocese of Detroit, Domestic Prelate.

Studies and Conferences.

Questions, the discussion of which is for the information of the general reader of the Department of Studies and Conferences, are answered in the order in which they reach us. The Editor cannot engage to reply to inquiries by private letter.

OUR ANALECTA.

The Roman documents for the month are:

POPE PIUS XI, *motu proprio*, directs that Ordinaries, except those under the jurisdiction of the S. Congregation of Propaganda or of the S. Congregation for the Church in the Orient, should apply solely to the S. Consistorial Congregation for the quinquennial faculties, and not to the other Offices of the Holy See.

ROMAN CURIA announces some recent pontifical honors.

MARYKNOLL MISSION LETTERS. XLII.

A CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY FOR SOUTH CHINA

When the Jesuits came to China in the sixteenth century they adopted this principle—"Work from the top down". Their success was remarkable. The Chinese Empire appeared to be on the threshold of conversion, when a decision of the Holy See intended to safeguard uniformity of Catholic ritual among the Chinese missionaries forced them to change their tactics. They no longer had any point of immediate contact with the mandarins and those highly placed. They turned to the evangelization of the simple and poverty-striken village folk who could be led to the Church by a judicious mixture of material aid and simple instruction. This has given us two million Catholics, four-fifths of all the Christians in China. And yet this is not much, out of four hundred and twenty-nine million pagans.

Father Gonnet, the famous old superior of the Shanghai Jesuits, believed the Chinese to be "un peuple moutonnier". They are indeed like sheep in their proneness to follow their leaders. This is a very striking characteristic of the Chinese

as a people. And so we must have leaders. We must create an élite and find means to influence the vast body of influential Chinese literati who now look upon our Church with scorn as the Church of the ignorant.

In the twentieth century in China the strong means of evangelization is education. Every missioner here is convinced of this. It is the open-sesame to the Chinese. If we could get into higher education here, we could raise up leaders among our own people, and we would also have the point of contact desired for direct action on the pagan élite.

Recognizing this, the Jesuits have opened a Catholic University in Shanghai which is designed to care for the educational needs of *North* China. At present *South* China is absolutely neglected in this respect. We have nothing—except the burden of answering to God for the care of two hundred million pagan souls.

We want a University. Two years ago the Bishops of South China in synod decided to take steps to secure one, but the plan did not materialize. This shows, at least, that the need is recognized by all. In the hope then that through God's help some move of this kind may be initiated, I am going to outline, as far as I can, the proposition. These details will give you a fair idea of the nature of the undertaking, and if any further information is required, I will be only too glad to furnish it.

I. THE NEED OF A UNIVERSITY

Our Catholic boys in South China have no place to go for higher education. There are at present fifty of these studying engineering, medicine, and education at Hongkong University, an agnostic institution. Some few go to America; but the expense is too great for most. From the Maryknoll Mission alone we could place fifty boys a year in the University.

Catholic higher education for pagan boys is as much desired as for our own. Nothing creates prestige for the Church like this. The number of pagan scholars for a university would only be limited by the capacity of the place. The avidity of the Chinese for higher education is a remarkable phenomenon, reminding one of the rush to the universities in the Middle Ages. There is hardly a school of any description

in the whole of China that is not forced to turn boys away for lack of room. One opens a school to-day, and it is filled to-morrow.

2. RESULTS—CERTAIN

The Church would be enabled to raise up its élite class of Catholics to influence their fellow countrymen.

The prestige created among the pagans would be immense. A by-product would be the standardization of the entire Catholic school system of South China. At present it is not organized. With a university standard to work toward, we could soon bring our grammar and high schools and colleges into line. In ten years' time they could be made entirely uniform.

3. DIFFICULTIES

Direct conversions in large numbers could not be hoped for soon. Converts would be the exception. This is odd; but it is the experience of almost every school in China. Hence from the standpoint of conversions, it would be rather a case of sowing seed for the future. The University would have to be satisfied to take the long view of things.

The climate here is tropical and enervating. The staff ought to be largely composed of young and vigorous men. The actual mode of living would not differ greatly from that at home, so far as creature comforts go; but the pagan atmosphere of China, the comparative isolation, and the strange customs, are all felt as difficulties. It would, in short, be semi-missionary work in character.

The mentality of the Chinese differs greatly from ours. Much patience, kindness, and tact are required for eminent success in working among them.

4. FINANCES

The Chinese Government would doubtless donate the land. It is the custom of the Government to make these grants.

The *initial expenditure* for buildings and equipment is perhaps the one big difficulty. This is what prevented the Bishops from realizing the plan two years ago. The Catholics here are too poor to help materially. The missionary bodies are about in the same boat. Consequently the organization that

establishes the university will have to bear the brunt of it. However, it ought to be a popular cause among Catholic people in general.

As for *upkeep*, the university would be self-supporting. The Chinese have plenty of money for education. Hongkong University is crowded to the doors with boys who pay the equivalent in tuition and fees of our best universities in America. The same can be said of almost all the institutions of higher learning in China.

There would be a slight difficulty here for the Catholic boys. Most of them are too poor to pay for university training. However, this would not affect the university. It would be the business of the missionary societies who sent them to provide for this.

5. COURSES

Engineering, Commerce, Medicine, and Education are the popular courses among the Chinese.

Law is not favored, as Chinese law practically does not exist.

There should be a good Arts College (B. A. degree).

A Normal School for teachers would be very popular.

A Theological School would be welcomed by all the Bishops. The present seminary at Panang, Straits Settlement, is not very strong. Here is where we touch the tenderest spot in our whole system—the lack of proper training for our native clergy. Our greatest need beyond any doubt is an educated and well trained Chinese clergy.

Even if the university did not see fit to establish a seminary properly speaking, a post-graduate theological school would be much patronized and would effect a world of good.

6. STAFF

Except in rare cases only men under forty years of age should come out, as the change in climate and manner of living is too much for settled men.

Chinese instructors would be very useful and could do much of the work. They would not be hard to find. Six Americans would be a good staff to start the work. Twenty Americans could take care of a university of a thousand boys, as they would all be divided up among five or six standard courses.

7. VARIA

To get the work started some help might be needed from men with practical experience on the ground. It might be well for the first year or so to call in as adviser some missionary who is thoroughly acquainted with the Chinese language and character. It will not be necessary for all the professors to learn the Chinese language, but the disciplinarians should know it.

The men who come out should be carefully chosen, from the viewpoint of working among a pagan people. Patience and kindness are the two indispensable requisites for wielding any influence. The men should also be strong and vigorous in health.

English would be the house language, and instruction in all the college and university classes would be given in English. This is the custom obtaining in all the foreign higher schools in China. These are about all the details that I can assert of my own personal knowledge.

The possibilities of such an undertaking are tremendous, and the project worthy of earnest consideration. To us here it would be the realization of our dearest wish. We are living in the twentieth century; progress everywhere is rapid; the ends of the earth are drawing together. China is awake; China is eager for modern progress. And China is crystallizing. For better or worse, she is fast assuming that permanent shape which she will no doubt bear in history. We have seen in the case of Japan what it means to have a pagan nation acquire all our material progress without the saving leaven of Christianity to offset it. Shall we stand by and watch that same day dawn for China? Observers here feel that it is coming, and coming fast. Yet we still have time. It is certainly a Macedonian cry, if there ever was one. It is the eve of doing big things, or else letting the psychological moment slip by and indulging in vain regrets.

If it be God's will, this great hope may be realized.

J. E. WALSH.

Wuchow, China.

SACRAMENTAL ABSOLUTION AND PEW RENT.

Qu. A well-to-do parishioner refuses to pay his pew rent, or anything toward the support of the church to which he belongs. May the confessor deny him absolution on the plea that he is not well disposed?

Resp. The general precept of contributing to the support of religion and its ministers is binding on all the faithful by the natural, the divine, and the ecclesiastical law. The determination of the amount to be paid in fulfilling the obligation is a matter of purely ecclesiastical law, may vary according to times and places, and is subject to all the disabilities of ecclesiastical laws.

In 1816, the following questions were submitted to the Holy See from the diocese of Bardstown: (1) "What must be considered the best way of providing for the support of the ministers of religion in these new regions?" (2) "What obligation rests on the faithful to fulfill this requirement?" (3) "Is it permitted to refuse spiritual ministration to those who refuse to submit to this obligation, or to those who belong to their families, e. g. to refuse to baptize their children?" The answers were: (1) "They should be provided for from the revenues of the churches and from the voluntary offerings of the faithful." (2) "The faithful are bound in conscience to support the ministers of the Church." (3) "This question ill befits a man in the service of the Church, and deserves rebuke; a question concerning the denial of sacred things, and above all baptism, to those who refuse to comply with the obligation of contributing."

This custom of securing the support of the Church and its ministers has persevered to our day. All modern theologians, following Kenrick (Tract. IV, 64), hold that until ecclesiastical law determines a fixed amount, absolution cannot be denied a person who refuses to contribute what his pastor or confessor considers his just share, or who refuses to contribute anything whatsoever.[1] If however through the parishioner's avarice, his pastor will be in need, or the other faithful be excessively burdened, the obligation by reason of the circumstances becomes grave and a penitent may be denied absolution if he refuses to amend.

[1] Balto. Concil. III, 292.

A MARRIAGE CASE.

Qu. Georgius, a parentibus acatholicis exortus, quinque annis natus, matre annuente, Baptismum in ecclesia catholica recepit. Caeremoniarum Baptisimi Georgius aliquantulum meminit. Attamen, anno nondum elapso, mater ejus decidebat et pater Georgii, religionem catholicam despiciens, celeriter Georgium in secta Presbyteriorum rebaptizavit, qui et in hac religione adolescebat. Anno 1920, Georgius, coram ministro civili, matrimonium inivit cum Bertha non-baptizata, sed post decem menses divortium civile obtinuit et nunc Georgius matrimonium inire cupit cum Maria, puella fervente catholica et praefecta sodalitatis Bae. Mae. Virg., et, si possit iterum religionem catholicam amplecti. Nihilominus Thomas, parochus Mariae, hanc sponsaliam sancire renuit, affirmans: "Matrimonium Georgii cum Bertha esse matrimonium verum et indissolubile et altera parte vivente neutrum posse ad novas nuptias transire." Sed non sic Joannes, vicarius co-operator Thomae, imperiose dicens: "Matrimonium Georgii cum Bertha esse matrimonium nullum: nam Georgius in ecclesia catholica baptizatus extra faciem ecclesiae non posse matrimonium contrahere."

Quaeritur: Quid ad casum propositum sit dicendum?

SEATTLENSIS.

Resp. The marriage between George and Bertha was invalid, but not for the reason assigned by the "imperiosus" assistant. He appears to contend that George cannot validly contract marriage, unless he observes the Catholic form of marriage. As a matter of fact, George is in no way bound to the observance of this form, prescribed by the *Ne temere*, and now incorporated with some change, into the Code; he is, however, by reason of his Catholic baptism, subject to the impediment of disparity of worship, which makes his marriage with Bertha, who was not baptized, invalid.

The change in legislation introduced by the *Ne temere* decree and the Code with regard to the impediments of clandestinity and disparity of worship, are easily confused, and it may not be amiss to restate them as they affect the case.

By the *Ne temere* decree, all persons baptized in the Catholic Church (i. e., with the intention, expressed by themselves or by their sponsors, of belonging to the body of the Church), or converted to it from heresy or schism, were bound to observe the Catholic form of marriage. No later defection from the

Church freed them from this obligation. All non-Catholics, baptized or unbaptized, were not bound by the decree, if they contracted marriage among themselves. A person, therefore, born of heretical parents but baptized in the Catholic Church, who before his seventh year fell into the hands of heretics and was reared as a heretic, was still held to the Catholic form of marriage.

In the articles in the REVIEW by Father (now Bishop) McNicholas (Vol. XXXVIII, 158, note) the hope was expressed that this class of persons be regarded as heretics, and be exempt from the Catholic form of marriage. This hope is fulfilled in the Code, which adds to the decree, that the children of heretics, though baptized in the Catholic Church, are exempt from the Catholic form of marriage, if from their infancy they are reared in heresy or schism, in infidelity or without any religion, whenever they contract marriage wth non-Catholics. (C. 1099—2). Thus George, though baptized in the Catholic Church, was not subject to the Catholic form of marriage.

In the old legislation, the impediment of disparity of worship existed between any baptized person and any unbaptized person. It made no difference whether the baptism was received in the Catholic Church or in an heretical sect. In the new legislation the impediment exists only between a person baptized in the Catholic Church, or who after baptism in an heretical sect, has been converted to the true faith, and an unbaptized person (C. 1070—1). Since the promulgation of the Code, therefore, marriages between non-Catholics are valid (1) if neither party has been baptized, (2) if both have been baptized in an heretical sect, (3) if one has been baptized in an heretical sect and the other is not baptized. The exemption from the Catholic form of marriage which the Code grants to those who, though baptized in the Catholic Church, have been reared in heresy or schism or infidelity, is not granted here, and hence the marriage between George and Bertha is invalid. If Bertha had been baptized, or if George had been baptized in an heretical sect, the marriage would have been valid.

BREAKING THE EUCHARISTIC FAST.

Qu. On All Souls' Day a priest said three Masses, and after the second by mistake took the first ablution. The third Mass was to be a requiem, and about 800 people gathered in the church. Not to disappoint them and be criticized, he said the third Mass also. Did he do right?

Resp. A priest who has broken his fast is not allowed to say another Mass if he foresees on the part of the people only the disappointment and surprise which would be occasioned, for example, by the omission of a weekday Mass in a parish church. Neither is he allowed to duplicate not fasting, in order to allow the people to fulfill the precept of attending Mass, as in neither case is there scandal involved, i. e. in neither case is the omission an occasion of sin to the people.

He is allowed to say another Mass not fasting, if the omission would be an occasion of sin to the people, i. e. if they would indulge in sinful criticism of the priest, in rash judgments which would involve his good repute, or rail at his carelessness, to the detriment of the entire priestly body. He is also allowed to repeat the sacrifice if he fears that many parishioners will not attend a Mass which is available in another church without serious inconvenience, as again the omission would be to them an occasion of sin.

Hence in a small country parish, where the pastor enjoys a good reputation and all who attend the second Mass are well known to him, he is not allowed to say the second Mass if he has broken his fast, as the people would readily understand an announcement of the reason why Mass is omitted, without any detriment to his reputation or to the ecclesiasical body. In a large urban parish, however, it is to be feared that the omission of any Mass which is attended with some solemnity as a Mass on a Sunday, or as in this case on All Souls' Day, would cause scandal, would give rise to sinful remarks, rash judgments, and would be detrimental to religion. In such cases the priest is justified in saying the second Mass, or on All Souls' Day the third Mass, if, according to his prudent judgment, scandal cannot be avoided.

ANOTHER VIEW OF THE MIXED MARRIAGE QUESTION.

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

My first appointment was in a parish made up of less than three hundred families, scattered over a very large territory. The majority of every one's neighbors and acquaintances were non-Catholic. It had been so for generations, from the settlement of the district. As might be expected, mixed marriages had been of common occurrence. It was a rather pleasant surprise, however, to find Catholicity flourishing in homes established on the occasion of a marriage before a Protestant minister. In many of these the Catholic party—usually the woman—had brought up a family with strict attention to their religious duties, while the non-Catholic husband evidently desisted from opposition, if he had ever offered any, and not infrequently had been received into the Church.

The prevalence of such conditions naturally stimulated further inquiry, which in turn gave further grounds for surprise. It was discovered that only in the rarest exception had a mixed marriage ceremony performed by a priest been followed by records at all consoling. The pastor, an old man, who had spent the greater part of his life among these people, seemed never to have adverted to this remarkable eventuation of things and was disposed to consider generalizations we young men were making *a priori* impossible. Only after going through the history of each case in detail was he willing to admit the unexpected result.

But one parish, however, had been heard from. What was there in these people to account for happenings so unusual? So we continued to reason then and afterward. Nearly thirty years have since elapsed and I am bound to confess that among the different congregations with whom I have become acquainted in that time the same state of things prevails.

It is only in recent years, repeated observations always pointing to the same outcome, that I dared mention it to the bishop of the diocese. The bishop's answer was, " Other priests make the same report; it is not at all hard to understand." The explanation the bishop proceeded to give was as follows:

When the marriage ceremony is performed by a priest, the Catholic young woman assumes that everything is all right.

There is nothing more to be done. Her marriage has been authorized by the Church; is that not enough? She has done her part in prevailing upon the Protestant party to consent to a marriage before the priest and to all conditions exacted. Her parents have probably offered no great objection (certainly her mother has not). There is very likely not one friend heard offering the slightest disapproval. Her Catholic acquaintances flocked to the ceremony and were profuse in their congratulations. Everything about the whole affair was considered highly respectable. There was not the slightest danger of being ostracized or losing caste in any quarter. What has she either to regret or to fear? What has she to be ashamed of? What is there to make amends for?

On the other hand, the young woman who through weakness or recklessness or a certain vague conviction that everything can be made right later, attempts a marriage contract before a minister or justice of the peace must not by that fact be adjudged entirely devoid of Faith.

Very soon she begins to realize the terrible risk she has taken, and as time goes on, the alarm becomes much greater. Can anything be done? It is quite clear that great efforts and sacrifices on her part will be necessary before she can enjoy anything like assurance or peace. Meanwhile in the eyes of her friends she is disgraced. No Catholic worthy of the name is entertaining anything short of horror for her conduct. Not one Catholic, however tepid or indifferent, will defend her. Few of her non-Catholic friends will be warm in their approval. If people look down upon her—as she is conscious they are doing—she has herself and no other to blame.

If she is ever to regain her former place in their esteem and affection, her life must be such as to convince all that she has more than made amends for her delinquencies. Should God bless her with a family, she realizes the grave responsibility she has assumed in making no provision for their Catholic training when such was still possible. She knows people will not fail to remind her of her folly should her children's Catholicity fall below the standard—at least, for certain she knows they will so judge and remark among themselves. Humbled, alarmed and anxious, her very fall has become the occasion of increased faithfulness and fervor. Her position,

her circumstances have given her strength of resolution. She has been humbled, keenly humbled, and her humility will become the groundwork of an earnest reform. Her prayers will not be neglected, because she feels the need of prayer, and like all true penitents, her coöperation with grace will lead her on to a vigor of faith and practice to which she might not have otherwise aspired.

Pastors constantly confronted with the mixed marriage question in all its phases may find this theory worthy of examination.

M. V. KELLY, C.S.B.

ORTHODOX TEACHING ON THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS.

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

"Long before Christ was born, the sacrifices of the Old Law shadowed forth the Sacrifice of the Cross. After His Ascension into heaven that identical Sacrifice is continued in the Mass. They greatly err, therefore, who reject the Mass on the ground that it detracts from the sufficiency of the Sacrifice of Christ on the Cross, when He *was offered once to take away the sins of many* (Hebr. 9: 28). That expiation of sin was absolutely complete; nor is it another but the very same that is in the Mass. For, since religious worship must always express itself sacrificially, our Divine Redeemer willed that the Sacrifice consummated on the Cross should be prolonged forever. This is done through the Mass, which is not a mere image or nude memorial of that Sacrifice, but the self-same, though outwardly different. And so the efficacy of the Mass, both in expiating sin, and in obtaining grace, derives wholly from the death of Christ." [1]

This is the traditional teaching of the Church, crystallized and officially promulgated. It shows that the theories of theologians who held that the Sacrifice of the Mass is other than the Sacrifice of the Cross, rest upon a false assumption.

ALEXANDER MACDONALD,
Bishop of Victoria.

[1] Extract from the Encyclical of Pope Leo XIII, *Caritatis Studium*, 25 July, 1898.

MISSIONARY AND PAROCHIAL SHEPHERDING.

A new magazine, *The Holy Ghost*, published monthly by the Missionary Servants of the Most Blessed Trinity at Cottondon, Alabama, appeals at once to the apostolic instinct of those who learn of its "Cenacle Plan". This includes four branches of home missionary work which might readily be taken up in any parish throughout the country, namely:

I. Shepherding (Preventive Work).

(1) Seeking the children on the streets or in their homes and gathering them: (a) for Mass on Sunday; (b) for Confession and Holy Communion; (c) for Sunday School; (d) for daily instructions to receive Sacraments.

(2) Visiting and urging the children to continue to assist at the Holy Sacrifice on Sundays and their sacramental practices.

(3) Urging negligent parents and guardians to have their children baptized and to send children of school age to the parochial school.

(4) Protecting children from evil companions and dangerous associations.

(5) Taking children out of and preventing them from going to proselytizing centers.

(6) Obtaining employment for young girls and boys.

(7) Clubs for young girls and boys:

Girls: Sewing, Story telling, Folk Dancing, Scouts, Dramatics and Choral Singing, Dressmaking, Crafts, First Aid Classes, Swimming, Physical Culture.

Boys: Scouts, Basket Ball, Games, Choral Singing, Swimming.

Mothers: Social Club.

II. Reclamation Work.

(1) Home Missionary Visiting. (2) Outside Work: (a) Interviewing People; (b) Suggestions, e. g. Books; Inviting negligent Catholics and non-Catholics to Missions and Special Services; (c) Edification; (d) Individual and Group Instruction; (e) Religion taught through pictures.

III. LIBRARY.

(1) Distribution of Catholic literature in homes and in public places.

(2) Creating a demand for Catholic books in libraries and getting objectionable books taken out.

(3) Keeping Catholic magazines and books in circulation.

(4) Mission work done through the Library.

IV. KINDERGARTEN, SUMMER OUTINGS, MISSIONARY NURSING.

(1) Sisters and Associates visit non-sectarian hospitals to instruct patients and to call a priest when necessary.

(2) Instruction classes conducted for chronic crippled children in hospitals.

(3) Visiting the sick and the dying in their homes, especially children.

(4) Distributing clothes and food.

PRIESTLY MINISTRY AT THE DEATHBED.

A writer in a recent number of the *Atlantic Monthly* gives his experience in three accidents that brought with them total unconsciousness, which is supposed to be the normal condition at the moment of death, when all vital activity has apparently ceased.

The priest who frequently attends the last moments of the dying and the apparently dying, has his own experiences both from personal observation and from the accounts of those who, having recovered, confide to him their most intimate thoughts. He concludes that persons who are seemingly unconscious often retain a keen sense which makes them alive to everything going on about them, or else affects them in a confused way, emphasizing certain impressions while substituting images and sensations for realities in other respects.

When therefore a priest attends an unconscious person for the purpose of preparing him for death it is wise to act on the assumption that the senses which are not capable of functioning outwardly may yet retain their power of perception through transference.

Both the sense of touch and above all the sense of hearing very often remain active or impressionable when all the other senses have ceased to act. Two things of great importance to the dying follow from this and should be taken into account by a priest who wishes to help them. In the first place, it is always to be presumed that the patient can hear you. Hence elicit the act of contrition, say all the prayers and instruct for the last rites just as if the unconscious person could listen and respond. Where no other answer can be obtained by gesture or speech, ask for a pressure of the hand. But even if that fails through the weakness of the patient, assume that your words are heard and assented to. For when all else that sustains human strength and energy fails, the mind realizes the loss and is most likely to turn to its only remaining resource —asking God's pardon and mercy.

Secondly, remember that, though the person is seemingly unconscious and unable to respond, it is not necessary to talk loud or shout. On the contrary, the patient is apt to be extremely sensitive to the slightest sound. Hence the invocations, prayers or instructions should be given in a moderate, gently devout tone of voice. It is cruel to shake people with "Do you know me?" or to declaim as if they were a square away. Any violent action may produce such shock and pain as to neutralize much of the beneficent effect of the priestly admonition. Let the words be soothing, helpful, and suggestive of that peace and quiet assurance that attaches to faith and hope in the consolations of religion.

PASTORAL DUTY "EX CARITATE" AND "EX JUSTITIA".

Qu. A priest visits a neighboring pastor, who happens to be absent. While there, a parishioner of the pastor falls fatally sick. Is the visiting priest bound "sub gravi ex caritate" to hear his confession or "sub gravi ex justitia"?

Again, supposing that this sick man is in the state of mortal sin, has he a strict right to the priest's services, or has he any right at all to the sacraments, i. e. right in the theological sense?

Resp. He is bound "sub gravi ex caritate", by the obligation every man is under to assist his neighbor in his spiritual necessities. This obligation with regard to a priest has been

incorporated into the positive law of the Church in Canon 892, § 2.

Every man has a right to the means necessary to salvation according to the regulations of ecclesiastical discipline. (Canon 682.) With regard to his pastor this right is based on the law of justice; with regard to other priests on the law of charity. In both cases it imposes a grave obligation on the priest to administer the sacraments in danger of death.

Ecclesiastical Library Table

RECENT THEOLOGY.

No little discussion has been occasioned during the past two years by the opinion of Cardinal Billot regarding the fate of infidels. The learned Cardinal, in a series of articles published in the *Études*, contended that among the vast multitudes of infidels that are found throughout the world there are many who never attain the use of reason from a moral and religious standpoint. Being, therefore, incapable of formal sin, these benighted creatures are to be classed with infants who die unbaptized.[1]

The Rev. M. Larivé, O.P., contributes to the first number of the *Revue Thomiste* for the current year a lengthy criticism of Cardinal Billot's theory, entitled "La Providence de Dieu et le Salut des Infidèles." Fr. Larivé contends that every normal adult reaches a stage of intellectual development which renders him capable of recognizing the existence of a Supreme Being and the obligation of the natural law. Even among the most degraded tribes religious and moral truths are known and believed. Moreover, Christ died for all, and the merits of His Passion and Death are available to all. That we cannot explain the precise manner in which Divine Providence bestows upon adult infidels the graces necessary for salvation, in no way militates against the universality of the Redemption and of God's salvific Will. St. Thomas's solution is that, if an infidel in invincible ignorance of the Gospel obeys the dictates of reason, God will make known to him the truths necessary for salvation, either through a missionary or by interior revelation.[2] Fr. Larivé is inclined to believe that the number of infidels who by their sins place obstacles to the light of divine Faith is very great. He quotes abundantly from Scripture, theological writers, and the official pronouncements of the Church, in support of his views.

Two articles on supernatural grace appear in the January and April numbers respectively of the *Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques*. The first article, "Le Point

[1] ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, Sept. 1921.
[2] *De Veritate*, q. XIV, art. 11.

d'Insertion de la Grâce dans l'Homme," by the Rev. M. J. Bliguet, O.P., is concerned with the difficult problem of the relation between divine grace and human nature. On the one hand, supernatural grace is something immanent in human nature, productive of vital acts; on the other hand, it essentially transcends every created nature and faculty. Fr. Bliguet explains St. Thomas's answer to this perplexing question—the theory of the *potentia obedientialis*. He adduces a number of texts from the various works of St. Thomas, to prove the complete consistency of the Angelic Doctor regarding the nature of this *potentia obedientialis*. In opposition to those who regard this *potentia* as something real and positive, Fr. Bliguet contends that it is only a non-repugnance of the rational creature to be elevated to the plane of the supernatural life.

The other article, " La Réalité de la Grâce dans nos Ames," is contributed by the Rev. R. Mulard, O.P. Starting with the principle that the love of God toward the creature is effective, i. e. productive of some positive effect in its object, the writer logically demonstrates that the supernatural love by which God has destined us to eternal life necessarily produces in our souls, during the present life, a created but supernatural quality which renders us worthy of the beatific vision. This quality is sanctifying grace.

Of interest to theologians and canonists alike is an article entitled " Privilège Paulinien et Mariages Mixtes " by the Rev. J. Creusen, S.J., in the *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* for February. The question is, whether a baptized heretic who has contracted marriage with an infidel and later becomes a Catholic may avail himself of the Pauline privilege to enter into another marriage, provided the necessary conditions are realized. Some have answered in the affirmative, arguing that the reasons for the privilege—danger to the faith of the neophyte, etc.—are the same, whether the conversion was from infidelity or from heresy. Fr. Creusen, however, holds that in the latter case the Pauline privilege is not applicable, for the following reasons: (1) The Church has always interpreted this privilege according to the literal form in which it is expressed (I Cor. 8: 12), i. e. as applying only to those marriages which have been contracted between two unbaptized

persons. (2) A marriage contracted between a Catholic and an infidel (with a dispensation) is never dissolved by the Pauline privilege. But the marriage of a baptized heretic and an infidel does not differ essentially from such a union. (3) The fundamental condition for the application of the Pauline privilege is not the acceptance of the true faith, but the reception of Baptism. For by Baptism one is made a member of a supernatural society, the Church. Accordingly it is fitting that on receiving Baptism he should be released from certain social bonds of an inferior order which may interfere with his newly acquired social condition, among which is the bond of matrimony with an infidel. But the baptized heretic who contracts marriage with an infidel is already a member of the Church and accordingly the character of his social obligations is not essentially changed by his acceptance of the true Faith.

Whether, however, the Sovereign Pontiff could annul such a marriage, in case of danger to the faith of the neophyte or refusal of the infidel to dwell with the convert, is another question. That the Pope possesses this power—although it has never been used—is the opinion of Fr. Creusen, who holds as a general principle that the only Matrimony which is absolutely indissoluble is a sacramental marriage that has been consummated.

Beginning with the present year, a new method has been adopted in the publication of *Orientalia*, which hitherto has been issued by the Biblical Institute of Rome. Hereafter, this periodical will appear in two distinct series—the "Semitic" and the "Christian"; the former under the direction of the Biblical Institute, the latter in charge of the Pontifical Oriental Institute. Each series will be composed annually of a number of scientific articles on Oriental subjects contained within its particular scope. The first article of the "Christian" series is in French, and is contributed by the Rev. M. d'Herbigny, S.J., President of the Pontifical Institute. Its title, "L'Unité dans le Christ," indicates its purpose—to prove that the unity which Christ desired in His Church can be obtained only by unreserved obedience to the Roman See. Besides the usual arguments from Scripture and Tradition, Fr. d'Herbigny quotes from modern Russian authors who recognize the weighty

arguments for the divinely-constituted primacy of the Roman Pontiffs. He narrates in detail the origin of the twenty-eighth canon of Chalcedon to which the schismatic Eastern Churches appeal in defence of their separation from Rome. This canon was enacted by only a small portion of the Eastern bishops and that in private session. Moreover, the preamble which attributes the primacy of Rome to an ecclesiastical decision appeared only in the time of Photius and Michael Cerularius.

Fr. d'Herbigny ascribes the origin of the Eastern schism principally to political conditions. He notes, as an encouraging presage of reunion, the rejection of state dominion by the Orthodox Greek and Russian Churches. Fr. d'Herbigny's clear and forceful presentation of dogmatic and historical truth, together with his extreme consideration for the feelings of non-Catholic readers, is worthy of the highest praise. As his article is principally intended for the members of the Orthodox Russian Church, it has been translated into their language.

The January-May numbers of the *Ephemerides Liturgicae* contain a study of the Eucharistic Epiklesis, from an historical and theological standpoint. The writer, Dr. J. Brinktrine of Paderborn demonstrates that the Epiklesis as found to-day in Greek liturgies—i. e. as an invocation to the Holy Ghost to change the bread and wine into the body and Blood of Christ —was not contained in the primitive Greek liturgies. The original Epiklesis was a prayer to the Holy Ghost for grace to receive the Holy Eucharist worthily. However, through an exaggerated parallelism between the Holy Eucharist and some of the other Sacraments (e. g. Confirmation), in which a distinct blessing of the *materia,* besides the Sacramental form, is necessary for validity, the opinion gradually grew that in addition to the Consecration the Epiklesis was necessary for the valid change of the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ. Then, naturally, this idea was expressed in the prayer to the Holy Ghost.

Dr. Brinktrine explains the Epiklesis, as it is allowed and approved by the Holy See for the Uniat Oriental Churches, as an interpretation of the essential form of the Sacrament —or, as he calls it, a secondary form.

In the *Gregorianum* for March Cardinal Billot continues his series of articles on the Hexaemeron. He rejects the

allegorical interpretation and the vision theory of the "six days", as well as the strictly literal interpretation of those exegetes who understand the "days" of Genesis as periods of twenty-four hours each. He himself defends the "periodic" theory, that the "days" were in reality long cycles of time. This interpretation, he asserts, is strongly confirmed by geological investigations.

A sad testimony to the rapid increase of unbelief is the recent appearance in Germany of Mauthner's two-volume *History of Atheism in the West* (*Geschichte des Atheismus im Abendlande*). Fr. Klimke, S.J., in the *Stimmen der Zeit* for February, gives a lengthy criticism of this pernicious work. The openly avowed purpose of Mauthner is to propagate atheism rather than to give an unbiased historical account. He professes crass materialism. God and the soul, he says, are self-contradictory terms, for they signify immaterial bodies. Fr. Klimke calls attention to some of the most prominent philosophical and historical inaccuracies. Mauthner asserts, for example, that St. Anselm was the first to recognize the necessity of a philosophical argument for God's existence; and that Occam ranks highest among the scholastics! Doubtless this "history" will find favor with those whose perverted will disposes them for the acceptance of atheism. However, as Fr. Klimke remarks in concluding his criticism, one advantage accruing from Mauthner's gigantic work is that it demonstrates how weak are the foundations on which atheism is built.

The dying commission of Christ to His Blessed Mother, "Woman, behold thy son" (John 19: 26) furnishes the subject of an interesting article by the Rev. F. Schüth, S.J., in the March number of *Pastor Bonus*. The writer's purpose is to demonstrate that the term "Woman", as used by Christ, in its literal sense designates the spiritual motherhood of Mary toward all mankind. Fr. Schüth adduces, in favor of this interpretation, the Encyclicals *Octobri Mensis* and *Augustissime Virginis* of Leo XIII, and the authority of several theologians of the first rank. He lays special emphasis, however, on the parallelism of the word "Woman" used in this text, with the Woman of the Protoevangelium (Gen. 3: 15) and the Woman clothed in the sun (Apoc. 12: 1). Fr. Schüth purposes in a later article to demonstrate the same doctrine of Mary's uni-

versal motherhood from the words of Christ to His Mother at the Marriage of Cana (John 2:4).

Prof. Dolger of the University of Münster has recently published the second volume of his archeological studies on the symbolism of the Fish, so frequently found in early Christian art. (*Der Heilige Fisch in den Antiken Religionen und im Christentum*). Professor Dolger devotes a great part of this volume to the study of the symbolic meaning of the fish among the pagan nations of antiquity—for he contends that Christianity took much of the symbolism and art of the pagan world and adapted them to its own doctrine and worship. Thus, the symbol of the fish, which was in common use in the religious cult of Syria, Thrace, Greece, etc., became, in the early Christian Church, the type of our Divine Redeemer.

Fr. Schultes, O.P., in his *Introductio in Historiam Dogmatam* has made a noteworthy contribution to present-day theological science. In a clear and simple manner he proposes the Catholic idea of dogmatic evolution as opposed to the fantastic notions that are in vogue outside the Church. He explains the exact meaning of implicit and explicit, formal and virtual revelation, and enumerates the various causes contributing to the progress of theological truth and the different stages that occur in the development of doctrine.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

Rome, Italy.

Criticisms and Notes

FIVE CENTURIES OF RELIGION. By G. G. Coulton, M.A.Camb., D.Litt., etc. University Lecturer in English. Vol. I, St. Bernard, His Predecessors and Successors, 1000-1200 A. D. Cambridge: At the University Press. 1923. Pp. 579.

The science of history, whose function is to establish facts in their contemporary setting and to interpret their influence upon successive ages, has during recent decades largely become a science of historical criticism. The cause of this specializing tendency is chiefly the discovery that history as written in the past is for the most part a biased and one-sided interpretation limited by the national, social, and religious prepossessions and prejudices of the writers. These sought national or party aggrandisement, or they yielded to the temptation to vent religious fanaticism, which is always a strong passion because it touches the highest and at the same time the least tangible interests of the soul.

A period in the history of the Church which suffered much from the last-mentioned tendency is that of the Middle Ages, the ages of faith, often tainted by a credulity which is akin to it in the way in which vice originates in exaggerated virtue, unless it be merely weakness. The Humanist revival, coincident practically with the invention of printing, gave to the so-called Reform party a disproportionate significance, aiding its aggressive opposition to the claims of ecclesiastical authority which had previously been supreme. It brought a flood of writing about the "Dark Ages" which became as common as the platitudinous repetition to-day of the claims of science and "modern progress" in opposition to theology. Thoughtful men, not of the faith which fought by a severe asceticism the old Teutonic and Frankish paganism with its self-indulgence and brutality, were astonished when S. R. Maitland, himself not a Catholic, vindicated the spirituality of the best medieval theologians against the hasty and ignorant accusations current in his day. "A very great deal might indeed be cited with equal truth on the opposite side" (p. 13). But, then, a great deal of this sort had been cited—too much in fact for the tolerant Maitland.

What men like Lord Acton and our present author chiefly complain of is that both sides exaggerated their accusations and defence, and that a fresh effort is needed by the scientific historian to establish a proper balance. With that aim all lovers of truth, so far as it reveals itself in history, must agree. Professor Coulton has laboriously collected material for twenty-five years. He possesses the

traditional historical instinct which knows how to follow a flair along given trails. His object is to write "a real history" (p. xxxii). His immediate scope in the volume before us is limited to a study of the cloistered religion of the later Middle Ages, in its main features of "monasticism". This involves a discussion of the religious activity of the Roman Catholic Church from the eleventh to the fifteenth century. It means the tracing of the obscure currents of history which led up to the Reformation tragedy. "We mark, on a broad canvas, the virtue of the virtuous, the vices of the villains, and the listless drift of the majority. The whole lesson of this institution (monasticism) with its greatness and its littleness can be learned from the last five centuries of the Middle Ages. Documents are abundant for the whole period, and the organism itself as yet is unmarred by any violent interruption of growth" (p. xxxvii). "This, then, is the bare chart of our coming journey; but everything depends upon the traveller's own eyes, and the disposition which he brings to his task of exploration."

Dr. Coulton does not then leave us in doubt about either his aims or the opportunities which were at his command to fulfil them. We may judge of his work, to which he sets himself with frankly stated sincerity, accordingly.

But an honest desire to see things as they are, and a large choice of documentary evidence, are not of themselves sufficient guarantee of the attainment of historical truth. Everything "in the last analysis depends on the traveller's own eyes and the disposition which he brings to the task of exploration", as Dr. Coulton himself assures us. How then are we to judge whether in his estimate of the documents which he selects for the arriving at objective truth, and in the conclusions he draws from his gathered evidence as a philosopher of history, he is trustworthy?

In reply one might take up successively each point of his argument, the ultimate purpose of which is to establish the truth about "the life and work of those myriads of nameless cloisterers who were so naturally dominant in the Middle Ages, and by whose own choice it has come about, that their successors count for so little in the world around us".

In other words, we may seek to pick flaws in the documents, which the author marshals in a way to show forth the failure of the Church that fathered the monastic system, and which Dr. Coulton believes is doomed, inevitably, to lose in its struggle against modernism. But this process of debate would involve a labor long and minute which is outside the domain of the ephemeral critic. We prefer to direct the attention of the unbiased reader to certain elements of omission (*supressio veri*) and the use of criteria which like a faulty lens

hinder an impartial vision, despite the best intention of the examiner of a well-presented object.

What will strike the thoughtful reader of Dr. Coulton's work, equally anxious about historical truth, is his forestalling estimate of writers who have approached the subject with which he deals in professedly the same spirit of candor, and whose sincerity and opportunities of research in documentary sources were no less than his, though of a somewhat different character. He speaks of Kenelm Digby and Montalembert as passionate panegyrists of the monastic system—"yet neither took his own creed seriously in practice". If that means these two men in order to prove their consistency should have become monks, we let the reader form his own estimate of the writer's judgment on the subject.

Of a more recent English writer on the subject of monasticism, the author of *English Monastic Life* and the medieval period in particular, Cardinal Gasquet, who was able to look at matters, like Mabillon, from the inside, being himself a monk and in command of the chief Benedictine sources of information, Dr. Coulton speaks less civilly. "Cardinal Gasquet claims also to rely upon original documents; but his omissions and reticences do almost as much as his downright misstatement to diminish the value of his writing for the serious reader." "Cardinal Gasquet's chapter on nunnery life, even more inaccurate than the rest, . . . worst of all his habit of withholding references for the documents he claims to quote," and so forth.

But there is an historian of our day, Johannes Janssen, who of set purpose and with opportunities far larger than those of which Dr. Coulton can boast, has practically covered the same ground of later medieval history in which monasticism played such a leading part. Of his honesty one should hardly conceive a doubt, though he wrote with Catholic prepossessions, which alone permit a true interpretation of what moved the leaders of public life in the ages of faith. He had the opportunity to answer his critics and justify his general conclusions from documents recognized as decisive; and if at times he gave the benefit of the doubt to the cause of religion, his successor Dr. Pastor balanced the natural tendency by fresh evidence. Considering the field which Dr. Janssen had to cover, few critics have charged him with narrowness or superficiality. Yet this is precisely what Dr. Coulton does. "It is characteristic of Janssen's prejudice and superficiality," etc. (p. 183); and, "though he writes far more plainly than any orthodox English Roman Catholic has dared to write in our generation . . . he practically ignores the evidence of one writer who destroys the whole apologetic fabric—Abbot Johann von Tritheim." As it would be possible "to fill a whole volume

with his (Tritheim's) evidence of monastic decay in all the Orders, including his own reformed congregation, Janssen's suppression of this evidence is the more noteworthy because he is constantly quoting Tritheim for comparatively trifling matters" (pp. 408 and 409). In short, Dr. Coulton holds it a mark of unhistorical superficiality not to have followed the judgment or accepted the statements of Tritheim, "one of the most distinguished among these orthodox reformers, who generalizes for us most clearly and conclusively" (*ibid*).

Here we have one key and a very important one to the untrustworthiness of Dr. Coulton as a critical historian. It is Tritheim's judgment which he accepts and his verdict by which he condemns other historians like Gasquet and Janssen, not to speak of writers like Montalembert who did not intend to write a critique but a general history of the influence of monasticism. What is the value, in the estimate of unbiased judges, of Tritheim as a critical witness of the things which Dr. Coulton thinks condemn the cause of monasticism and the Catholic Church of which it was a stronghold in the Middle Ages? Tritheim, the Abbot of Spanheim, was an exemplary monk and a good writer. So think Wharton and d'Artigny, and we may safely accept their judgment. But as an historian, short of his industry, little can be said to commend him as a guide in important issues. Danoug in the *Bibliographie Universelle* sums up without prejudice what is to be thought of him. "La chronologie de l'abbé de Spanheim est souvent fautive." Scioppius, who readily credits him with sincerity and piety, "lui souhaiterait une critique plus judicieuse". "Tirthème, en effet, partage la credulité, les préjugés, le mauvais gout des auteurs allemands de son siècle." He was indeed but a youth when he undertook to write his *Penthikos,* styled "liber lugubris de statu et ruina monastici ordinis". His zeal and enthusiasm, as Baillet points out, led him to exaggerate in a way which makes the clever bibliophile exclaim: "Qu'il n'y a rien de moins exact que ce qui a été écrit sur cet ordre (de S. Benôit) par Trithème."

All this suggests that the security which our author demands from others, whom because he believes them lacking in it, he dismisses with the disdain of superior acquirements, is absent from his own judgment as to the value of sources. But we might offer actual examples of such absence if it were not that the inaccuracy and superficiality of which Dr. Coulton is guilty, and which he knows how to disguise by a plausible pretence of impartiality and high purpose, has been exposed by other critics, such as Fr. Herbert Thurston, S.J., and Fr. Leslie Walker. The latter in a recent critique of *Anglican Essays* (Macmillan Co., 1923) writes: "Why

is it that Mr. Coulton so often quotes or misquotes documents which seem to favor his hypotheses, but never quotes the same documents when they flatly contradict those hypotheses?"

What Dr. Coulton would like to demonstrate is that the Catholic religious orders which were paramount in influence among the forces of European civilization during pre-Reformation times, have ceased altogether with the suppression of monasticism by the civil states. "Every government in Europe has gradually followed Henry VIII's example; and herein the State seems to express the mind of the individual, since adult vocations to the cloister are now extremely rare, among men at least" (p. xxxiv). We might agree with the author that monasticism, as we know it to have been in medieval times, though it represented the chief civilizing factor in Europe from the days of Benedict down to the Lutheran revolt, has lost its influence by ceasing to exist. Why not? A tree grows old, its branches decay, and its trunk becomes gnarled and rots. But that means nothing as regards the growth of the Church. From within and from below there is a renewal of fresh shoots with a different appearance of youth and slender delicacy, having the same fruit-bearing energy, not to speak of the seeds shed by the old plant and renewing its life in other parts. "Vocations to the cloister are rare." If by cloister you mean the monasticism and ancient traditions that flourished in the days of the Carlovingians—perhaps so. Anchorites and monks do not fit so readily into the industrial and social developments of modern life. We have fewer recluses and stylites, because the highways are open to run them down, and to distract the solitary from his contemplation. But in their places others have come—sons of Loyola, Vincent de Paul, Alphonsus, and countless regulars. Few? Dr. Coulton might write their numbers in high thousands. Their forces count more than those which the professional historians and men of learning may exercise for the cause of truth and charity in the modern world.

GENERAL LEGISLATION IN THE NEW CODE OF CANON LAW. General Norms (Can. 1-86). Ecclesiastical Persons in General (Can. 87-214). By the Very Rev. H. A. Ayrinhac, S.S., D.D., D.C.L., President of St. Patrick's Seminary, Menlo Park, Prof. Moral Theology and Canon Law. New York: Blase Benziger and Co. 1923. Pp. 378.

Fr. Ayrinhac has already given us specimens of his method and interpreting power as a canonist by his two volumes on Marriage and on Penal Legislation in the new Code. The introductory canons aid us in understanding much that follows, for, as the author suggests in his preface, on the first six canons depend the other twenty-

four hundred for their correct application. These include a comparison between the former body of laws and the new, which supersedes all previous canonical collections, forming the complete source of general ecclesiastical jurisprudence to-day. A question that has frequently been raised since the enforcement of the new Code is that of "privileges", including custom or prescription. Here, as in other cases of doubtful application of law, the Pontifical Commission appointed to decide contentious matters has already established certain precedents for judicial decisions. Of these Fr. Ayrinhac takes note. The principle, "Quod alicui gratiose conceditur trahi non debet ab aliis in exemplum", becomes a main source of direction in what has always been a chief danger in the application of special concessions. The laws of analogy do not apply in such cases.

The second part of the volume, which deals with the condition, obligations and privileges of the clergy, the hierarchy, and the prelacy, offers particular attraction to the average priest, because it defines his status, his jurisdiction, and duties. The latter include not only administrative action and the offices of canonical obedience, but also the restrictions that regulate the life of the cleric. Those who mean to live up to the dignity and responsibilities of the clerical state will here find much that disapproves of custom and local tradition. We may thank our author for fearlessly stating for American students and those who direct the future activity of the pastoral clergy what concerns the ecclesiastic regarding study, clerical dress, and external appearance, public amusements, trading, and intercourse with women, in all of which matters a kind of laxity is invading the priesthood amid the spirit of modern secular culture. This, if nothing else, among the numerous interpretations of the Code at our disposal, makes the new English interpretations of ecclesiastical rule by Fr. Ayrinhac of special value.

FATHER PRICE of Maryknoll, Missioner in North Carolina, Co-Founder of Maryknoll, Missioner in China. Compiled by a Priest of Maryknoll, New York. Pp. 93.

A short biography of Father Thomas F. Price, who died as a pioneer of the Maryknoll Mission work in China, 12 September, 1919, written by a member of the Catholic Foreign Mission Society, pictures for us a priestly figure of gentle, untiring zeal for the salvation of souls. The outstanding qualities of mind and heart that distinguished him among his fellow priests from the very outset of his ministry were a deep devotion to Our Blessed Lady, which somehow crystallized around Lourdes and little Bernadette; unflag-

ging industry in the work of preaching by voice and pen; and a quiet, humble surrender of himself to the service of his brethren. He had a mind of his own and a pertinacity of purpose, as well as ideals and visions of a personal mission; but these qualities never roused in him a spirit of self-assertion or opposition.. He took criticism with a gentle submission, and sought to accommodate himself, or else went quietly apart to labor without jarring on his surroundings. When told that he was no preacher, he would answer: "May I not then rely on prayer?" When, after having gone through a town in North Carolina, inviting the people to hear the Gospel of Christ, he found but a few children to listen to him, he would explain to them the eternal truths as earnestly as if he had before him a select audience of thoughtful men. He would ride or walk miles through dreary districts to prepare a poor negro for death, would sleep in the cell with a prisoner condemned to execution, bear smilingly all kinds of insults and abuses from a fanatic mob, so that he might gain a soul to Christ. These are beautiful traits in a priest who made no pretension to brilliancy, administrative ability or learning, yet who left the impress of enduring forces after him and whose career has since his death become an inspiration to many who are perhaps more gifted in the arts that attract as adjuncts to missionary activity.

Father Price was born in 1860. His father was the editor of the first daily newspaper in North Carolina, the *Wilmington Daily Journal*. Both he and his wife were converts to the Catholic faith, and young Price, in later days, when a student with the Sulpician Fathers in Baltimore, kept up the friendly relations that had existed between his parents and Dr. James A. Corcoran, who was then professor at Overbrook Sminary. In 1886 he was ordained and assigned to mission work, which at the time covered the whole eastern section of North Carolina, a district of about three hundred square miles. Two years later he took up his residence at New Bern, which had seventeen or more missions attached to it. He built a church at Goldsboro, though most of his apostolic work was done in temporary shacks or in the open. Later he enlarged the church at Newton Grove, and built others at Halifax and Nazareth. While at Raleigh in 1895 he conceived the idea of publishing a paper that might aid him in his apostolate, especially among non-Catholics who needed to be enlightened through the press, in order to neutralize the unreasoning prejudices which existed all through the South against the Catholic Church. The work was not only difficult but also wholly ungrateful, since bigotry has a way of defeating the sincerest efforts, and Fr. Price met with persistent discouragement and apparent failure. Coming in contact with Father James A. Walsh, the

present Superior of the Maryknoll Missions, who was at the time (1910) Archdiocesan Director of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith in Boston, a plan of amalgamating their interests and work of missionary endeavor resulted in the establishment of the Americal Foreign Mission Society. Here Father Price gained by his silent labors the crown of martyrdom. His tomb in far-off China marks the first milestone of the Maryknoll journey leading countless souls, in the train of the King, to heaven.

THE POOR SOULS IN PURGATORY. A Homiletic Treatise with Some Specimen Sermons. By the Right Rev. P. W. von Keppler, D.D., Bishop of Rottenburg. Adapted into English by the Rev. Stephen Landolt. Edited by Arthur Preuss. B. Herder Book Co.: St. Louis, Mo., and London. 1923. Pp. 203.

Bishop Keppler points out the duty of the pastor to care for the souls that may be helped by prayer. "It depends largely on him what measure of love, prayer and suffrage is offered for the Poor Souls." He will do well to take that duty seriously, even for his own sake. Can it be properly complied with by one sermon a year, on All Souls' Day?

In a dozen or more chapters of brief and succinctly gathered arguments from sources with which the student of theology is familiar, but which are here presented in homiletic form, the author gathers certain practical principles which he calls "Homiletic Directions", calculated to animate the preacher to a right and frequent use of his theological lore. Next he gathers "Texts and Sermon Sketches", good illustrations of how the topic may be handled for All Souls' Day, Good Friday, or some Sunday evening in November. The volume is a useful one, despite the abundant sources to which priests might go for such matter and of which Dr. Preuss gives a list of some thirty volumes of English homiletic literature on devotion to the Holy Souls in purgatory.

JESUS CHRIST AND THE SPIRIT OF YOUTH. By Frank Ilsley Paradise, formerly Dean of Christ Church, New Orleans, U. S. A. Small, Maynard and Company: Boston. 1923. Pp. 236.

Papini's Life of Christ has given a new attitude to men outside the Church, and in a way to those within also, toward the image of Christ as a model of life. The Italian writer addresses the man in the street. The Rev. F. I. Paradise gives us a presentation that appeals in the first place to youth. His writing, at once persuasive and rational, presents a vivid story of Christ's youth, of His man-

hood, and of His divine power as Redeemer. The author appeals to the Gospel sources throughout; but he introduces his narrative by reflections that place the reader in the position of an inquirer into the truth of what the Christ represents. Up to the age of developed reasoning power the child gets impressions of the personality and teaching of Christ which are based on feeling and faith. Then amidst the gradually growing attractions and interest of secular life the youth loses the apprehension of the sentiment, and comes to demand reason and demonstrated fact as a basis of his trust. The presence of Christ, of God, which accompanied his imaginings in childhood, leaves him, and he finds himself doubting amid the expanding life of knowledge and experience. Christ no longer is to him a living companion, even if in a sense His image remains the cause of an emotion, as other figures in story or friendly association may be. Such is the position which our author assumes in the youth of to-day for whom he writes in order to make Christ a new reality by historical evidence as well as an appeal to the moral sentiment which finds room in every uncorrupted heart.

This is not, however, the precise attitude of the Catholic youth in whom the sentiment of faith has been nourished under proper auspices. For the mystery of the Sacrament in which Christ condescends to the needs of men, and to which our author touchingly alludes, though it is no part of Protestantism, gives to the adolescent Catholic a sense and constant realization of the presence and companionship of Christ, which is being fostered all along his career by the divine mysteries of the altar in the Mass and Holy Communion. Here lies the great difference between faith in the Catholic and the religious feeling or aspirations of those outside the Church who lack the continuous interaction with Christ in the Real Presence of the Holy Eucharist. At no hour in life can a Catholic escape the reminders of that Reality and companionship, unless he close his senses to the claims of his Church.

But our author writes with a beautiful appreciation of Christian and human values, whence we fancy that his life of Christ, while it is not written to fulfil its purpose with Catholic youth, will yet appeal strongly to those who hesitate on the threshold of truth. Prospective converts are often helped by such books. For the rest, the method of presenting the facts or data of the life of our Lord to youth here adopted is one that might strengthen faith by emphasizing the reasons for it in those who stray from the fold through the attractions of scepticism. We may differ from the writer as to certain theories, such as the assumed fact that the "Logia" represent the Aramaic Gospel of St. Matthew mentioned by the early Fathers, but it is easy to see the advantage of introducing the Life

of Christ by a definite and reasoned reference to the sources of our knowledge regarding Him, and of the conditions through which the advent of Christianity has become a renewal of strength unto life and happiness—a true test of progress and culture.

Literary Chat

The prospectus issued by the Catholic Summer School for the Thirty-Second Annual Session presents a program of lectures that can hardly fail to meet the demands of every sort and variety of intellectual and esthetic taste. If one wants to know something about the practical applications of Philosophy, the lectures of the first week (2-6 July) supply the demand. If one desires to learn of men who proved by their lives and works "the harmony between science and revealed religion", the closing course (27 August–24 September) answers this desire. The eight weeks intervening offer a rich variety of lectures covering many interesting topics relating to history, science, art, and literature. Besides the general courses there is a special series on sociological subjects arranged for four of the weeks of the session. These relate particularly to educational and industrial problems.

It is late in the day to bespeak the merits of Cliff Haven as a vacational resort. It will be hard to find any one spot so invigorating to soul and body, so rich in natural beauty, and equipped with so many facilities for healthful recreation, as is the home of the Catholic Summer School on the shores of the majestic Lake Champlain, fanned by the breezes ever interchanging between the verdant Adirondacks of New York on the west and the Green Mountains of Vermont on the east. But what Catholics prize most of all are the social and religious advantages afforded them at Cliff Haven. Here they have whatever health and rest-giving facilities that can be found elsewhere, but they share these advantages with their brethren of the faith, and in the midst of a social environment that is permeated by a Catholic atmosphere as genial as it is salutary.

Naturally there are some people—especially among those who have never seen the Summer School except from the windows of the Montreal Express, or have "taken it in" *en route*—who hold vacationing and summer-schooling to be incompatible. Indeed, it must be confessed that not a few of those who visit and even sojourn on the grounds, carry out this view in practice, if not in theory. They confine themselves conscientiously to the "summering" business; the "schooling" interests them not at all. On the other hand, people who really know by adequate experience the scholastic ideals of the Champlain Assembly, and how these are secured, recognize that it is quite possible to profit by the intellectual advantages offered at Cliff Haven and at the same time enjoy a pleasant and a restful and a real vacation.

De Concordantia Dictorum Thomae, in the current issue of the *Gregorianum* (Rome), by F. Pelster, is a noteworthy contribution to Thomistic literature. It establishes by creditable argument the genuine authorship of a work which, hitherto neglected as spurious, explains a number of seemingly contradictory statements in the Saint's Commentary on the *Sentences* and the *Summa*. The differences in these writings have hitherto caused endless polemics, in which two opposite schools of theologians claimed the authority of the Angelic Doctor with apparently equal plausibility. The *Concordantia*, written toward the end of the Saint's life, aims at reconciling the divergencies, and thus serves to settle a number of disputed points in theological controversy.

The same issue of the *Gregorianum* concludes a discussion by the learned Cardinal Billot on the exegesis and dogmatic value of the first verses in Genesis, in which he demonstrates that the view which interprets the Genesiac days as cosmic epochs, corresponding to a progressive development in harmony with geology and natural science, is the only tenable one in the present state of scientific evidence.

The *Catholic Directory of India, Burma and Ceylon for 1923* presents a creditable showing of missionary activity in the East Indies. With a Catholic population of more than two and a half million (including Dacca and Kandy from which districts no reports are forwarded, and also the Oriental branches), the average three thousand priests, religious and secular, have their hands full to feed the flocks under their care or within their reach. The largest number of pagan adults baptized, nearly four thousand, is recorded in Calcutta, though Quilon proportionately to its given resources seems to overtop all the other provinces. Hyderabad baptized twenty-three hundred pagan adults, Colombo, Bombay, Malacca, Trichinopoly, Ernakulam have each over a thousand converts. Goa for some reason or other seems to lag behind, if we may judge from the report, which is however manifestly insufficient on which to form an accurate judgment. Part of the territory, including Changanacherry, Ernakulam, Kottayam and Trichur, is governed by Vicars Apostolic of the Syro-Malabar Rite, and under the Sacred Congregation for Oriental Churches.

Judged from the national point of view, the condition of Catholics in India is somewhat of a problem. The twenty-eight ecclesiastical divisions under the immediate control of Propaganda, in 1921, had 1481 priests to minister to the needs of the faithful. Of these, one-third were Indian; the other two-thirds Europeans, for 1,560,827 of the Catholic population. The Goa Patriarchate with its divisions under the Portuguese Padroado, counting in all 604,802 Catholics, supports 1039 priests, of whom 989 are Indian. Here is a great difference in the character of the pastoral responsibility, and a disproportion between priestly ministry and the needs of the faithful. The detailed study of the *Directory* offers many other interesting items to the student of ecclesiastical contemporary history, and the compiler of the volume deserves much credit for the manifest aid he offers. The Jesuit Fr. Houpert's paper on progress of Catholicity in India gives to the analysis of the tables a good basis for the conclusion which he draws for the future of India from present indications.

The Dissertations submitted by candidates for the Doctorate in Philosophy at the Catholic University belong, as a rule, to a high order of literary and critical merit. The Norbertine Father Francis X. Exler adds a treatise on Letter Correspondence in the Greek language as it is known to the student of Egyptian culture, that is to say, during the Ptolemaic and succeeding Roman period between the third century before and the third century after Christ. *The Form of the Ancient Greek Letter* is of interest not only to the philologist but also to the historian. We glean much of the inner social and official life, at a time when our Septuagint Version of the Bible was made. Hence, although our author confines his study to a critical examination of the formulæ in use among Hellenists and Hellenic writers of the time, rather than to the contents of the Letters which are varied, we are made familiar with the phraseology and meaning of terms, most of which are retained by the early Christian Fathers and apologists. In addition to the material found in earlier writers on the subject, such as Orelli, Westermann, and Hercher, Fr. Exler utilizes the more important finds of recent date in the hills and tombs of Egypt. Priests who are fond of the Greek classics will be delighted with the study of the young Premonstratensian professor.

Brother Leo, of the de La Salle Brothers of the Christian Schools, offers teachers and students an excellent commentary on the essential relations of religion to the English

branches of our school curriculum, in his modest volume *Religion and the Study of Literature*. We are apt, as non-Catholics mostly are, to regard letters and art as distinct from Christian doctrine and religion, and this even while on general principles we maintain the necessity of parish schools and higher Catholic instruction. Ecclesiastical training is not exempt from the danger of losing sight of the informing and vital element that refers the so-called secular branches to the Catholic philosophy of life. The humanists of the sixteenth century have shown to what extremes the distinction may lead. Brother Leo shows us how to teach literature through theology, as taught in the Imitation, the "Little Flower", etc., without sacrificing any of the esthetic elements which the study of literature is intended to cultivate. It is wisdom to put Brother Leo's book in the libraries of Catholic clubs, and in the seminaries, as well as in the hands of the Sisters who teach, and their more advanced pupils.

Jus Pontificium, a Roman quarterly, now in its third year, is a valuable interpreter of our present ecclesiastical laws. Canon Alberto Toso makes his comments coincide with the responses, as far as practicable, of the Pontifical Commission. Other matter is of immediate interest for the moral theologian. Thus in the last issue (March) P. P. G. Arndt, S.J., discusses the accountability of a confessor who deceives the "particeps in peccato turpi" in order to escape the censure himself. Whilst the writer does not pretend to decide the question, he gives good reasons for convicting the offending priest. A dissertation by the learned Dominican P. Noval, on the "Modus corrigendi et puniendi", interprets the Code for judicial and extra-judicial instances. (Rome: Piazza SS. Apostoli, 51, Administr. Jus Pontificium.)

Father Garesché in one of the chapters of his latest booklet, *Ever Timely Thoughts*, tells of how to root out evil and how to acquire good habits. There is no particular novelty in what he says; just the happy, appealing way whereby he leads one to stop repeating bad deeds and to take up the re-doing of good ones. The writer himself, unconsciously perhaps to himself, has acquired the good habit of making good books; and that by making them again and again. *Ever Timely Thoughts* completes a decade of similar collections. Father Garesché, as everybody has come to see, knows how to spiritualize the whole of life—all its details, circumstances, relations, happenings, commissions, omissions. His motto seems to be L. N. B. L.—let nothing be lost — for God, and the best, highest and happiest interests of human beings. In *Ever Timely Thoughts* the principle is again happily illustrated. A human book, its appeal will be felt both by priest and people. (Benziger Brothers, New York.)

The third number of the *History of England Series* which Father Ernest Hull, S.J., has in hand has recently appeared. The small brochure volume (150 pages) comprises the reigns of John, Henry III, and the later medieval period. Though the three centuries covered include some of the largest and most complicated of medieval history subjects concerning the relations of Church and State, Father Hull unravels them with that mastery of facts, discrimination of causes and values, which we have noted as characteristic of the preceding numbers of the series. The new volume includes the eve of the Reformation. The reader will look eagerly for the fourth, wherein the great revolt which tore Canterbury from Rome and introduced the Babel which has since confused the religious life of England and her colonies, is to be discussed. The book is issued by the Examiner Press, Bombay, and is carried by P. J. Kenedy, New York, and the Herder Co., St. Louis, Mo.

The Unending Sacrifice, the title of a small pamphlet (pp. 32) by Father Reville, contains a lucid exposition of the Church's doctrine on the Mass. From it Catholics may derive a clear idea of the central act of their religious life, so as to communicate it, as occasion offers, to their separated brethren. (The American Press, New York.)

The fact that the *Communion Prayer Book* compiled by a Sister of St. Joseph has reached its twelfth edition (315,000 copies) may be taken as testimony to the suitability of the little manual (pp. 240) which is printed in large black-faced type and issued in strong morocco binding by D. B. Hansen & Sons, Chicago.

Boys young and old who have read Father Boyton's *Cobra Island* need not be told to look for plenty of action in *Whoopee,* the author's latest evocation of the things boys like and live, do and don't do. The story has not the far-away mysteriousness of the Indian Seas which lent a zest to its forerunner, but it possesses the elements of adventure and fun, which camping and canoeing furnish to a healthy boy and that savory seasoning which the faith supplies and helps to preserve in him innocence with fun, character with the animality that never ceases to be rational if not wholly reasonable. (Benziger Brothers, New York.)

Books Received

SCRIPTURAL.

HERMENEUTICA BIBLICA. Scripsit Franciscus Xav. Kortleitner, Ord. Praem. Fel. Rauch, Oeniponte; Frid. Pustet, Ratisbonae et Neo Eboraci. 1923. Pp. 159.

THEOLOGICAL AND DEVOTIONAL.

PROBATIO CHARITATIS. Meditationes ad Usum Cleri. Auctore Hieronymo Mahieu, S.T.D., in Seminario Brugensi olim Directore, Illmi. ac Revmi. Episc. Brug. a Secretis, Eccl. Cathedr. Brug. Can. Capit. Editio tertia auctior atque emendatior. C. Beyaert, Brugis. 1923. Pp. xxi—609.

CATHOLIC DOCTRINE AND PRACTICE. By the Rev. John Lee, P.P. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 1922. Pp. xvi—532. Price, $3.50.

COURS D'INSTRUCTIONS DOMINICALES. Par Chanoine R. Turcan. Troisième édition. P. Téqui, Paris. 1923. Pp. xv—423, 360 et 391. Prix, 20 *fr. franco.*

UNE AME DE CRISTAL. Lettres Inédites de Marie Jenna à Mathilde Aussant. Publiées avec une Introduction et des Notes. Par M. l'abbé Jean Vaudon. P. Lethielleux, Paris. 1923. Pp. lix—495. Prix, 13 *fr. franco.*

DE DEO OPERANTE in omni operatione naturae creatae praesertim liberi arbitrii, Divi Thomas Aquinatis doctrina. Auctore Dr. Joanne Stufler, S.J., theologiae dogmaticae professore in universitate Oenipontana. Verlagsanstalt Tyrolia, Innsbruck. 1923. Pp. xx—423.

SAUVONS NOS AMES! Par l'Abbé Charles Grimaud, Professeur a l'Externat des Enfants-Nantais. Deuxième édition. P. Téqui, Paris. 1923. Pp. 305. Prix, 5 *fr.* 50 *franco.*

THY LOVE AND THY GRACE. An Eight Days' Retreat for Religious. By Cuthbert Lattey, S.J. B. Herder Book Co., London and St. Louis. 1923. Pp. 296. Price, $2.00.

MIRACLE ET MYSTIQUE. Par Dom S. Louismet, O.S.B. (3) P. Téqui, Paris. 1923. Pp. 295. Prix, 5 *fr.* 50 *franco.*

ST. GABRIEL, PASSIONIST. By Father Camillus, C.P. With Preface by Cardinal O'Connell. P. J. Kenedy & Sons, New York. 1923. Pp. ix—278. Price, $1.60 *postpaid.*

ST. FERDINAND DE FLORISSANT. The Story of an Ancient Parish. By Gilbert J. Garraghan, S.J. Loyola University Press, Chicago. 1923. Pp. 271. Price, $1.50.